

Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards



Strategic Plan Initiative Phase II Research:

2002 Survey of Michigan Law Enforcement Agencies And State Standards and Training Commission/ POST Agencies



JOHN ENGLER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT STANDARDS
LANSING

RAYMOND W. BEACH, JR.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

August 8, 2002

In 2000, the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards embarked on a long-range strategic plan to shape the future vision of the Commission and the profession of law enforcement in Michigan. As part of the research phase of the plan, we conducted surveys in March 2002 of all law enforcement agencies in Michigan and the respective law enforcement standards-setting agencies in other states.

The enclosed Executive Summary of the survey results highlights the findings; the full report including appendices with responses by Michigan agency size and type as well as state-by-state responses from the standards-setting agencies is enclosed on compact disc.

This effort would not have been possible without the cooperation of the state standards agencies and Michigan law enforcement agencies. We hope that this information will go beyond our needs and prove useful to your agency as well.

If you have any questions regarding the survey results or documentation, please feel free to contact David Lee in our Career Development Section at (517) 322-5435 or via e-mail at leeda@michigan.gov.

Sincerely,

Raymond W. Beach, Jr.
Executive Director

Col. Stephen D. Madden • Mr. William Dennis, Representing Ms. Jennifer Granholm • Chief Jerry Oliver • Mr. John Buczek
Director Robert Denslow • Mr. James DeVries • Sheriff Thomas Edmonds • Mr. David Morse • Mr. Douglas Mulkoff • Tpr. Timothy Permoda
Sheriff Gary Rosema • Chief James St. Louis • Officer Richard Weaver • Chief Jeffrey Werner • Sheriff Henry Zavislak

Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Strategic Plan Initiative

2002 Survey of Michigan Law Enforcement Agencies and State Standards and Training Commission/POST Agencies

Executive Summary

In March 2002, MCOLES staff conducted surveys of all Michigan law enforcement agencies and the other states' respective law enforcement standard-setting agencies. The survey was undertaken as part of a multi-year strategic planning initiative to continue to develop law enforcement standards and training in Michigan.

The Michigan agency survey consisted of three sections: selection and employment standards, in-service training, and carry concealed weapons training. The standards agency survey consisted of four sections: selection and employment standards, law enforcement certification, in-service training, and training academy accreditation. A separate survey of Michigan Waiver of Training candidates and hiring agencies was also conducted and included.

With more than 46% of the Michigan agencies responding (314) and slightly more than 56% of the state standards-setting agencies responding (30 out of 51, including the District of Columbia), the results were compiled into a summary report with extensive appendices. Michigan agency responses were categorized by both agency type and agency size.

Highlights of the results for each survey component are presented below. These survey results will be used to focus the direction of the MCOLES Strategic Plan research teams through the planning process.

Selection and Employment Standards (Michigan and Standards Agency Surveys)

For each of the current Michigan selection and employment standards, the Michigan agencies were asked to indicate whether the standard is relevant and appropriate; the other states' standards agencies were asked to indicate if there was a similar standard in place in that state.

While a majority of agencies confirmed that each standard is relevant and appropriate, five of the standards were identified as potential areas for review:

- Minimum Age;
- Michigan (in-state) Driver's License;
- Height/Weight Proportional (Body Mass Index);
- Medical/Psychological Standards; and
- Good Moral Character.

The utility, operational definitions and assessment protocol for each of these standards will be reviewed by appropriate subject matter experts from the law enforcement community, appropriate professions, and members of academia. Conclusions and any recommendations for change will be presented to the full Commission for review.

Issues to be considered will include consideration of mandatory versus advisory standards, the limited employment pool, and any added cost for new or modified standards.

Law Enforcement Certification (Standards Agency Survey)

The law enforcement certification section consisted of two parts: initial certification and advanced certificates. The initial certification questions focused on whether states issue full certification, or require an interim licensing period prior to full certification.

Of the 26 states responding that issue certification or licenses, eight initially issue a limited license or certification. Full licensure from these states is contingent on a variety of factors:

- Time of service with a single or multiple agencies;
- Probationary periods;
- Mandatory field training;
- Approval of agency head; and/or
- Secondary certification exams.

Advanced certificates and requirements varied among the states, including Intermediate and Advanced Officer certificates, Specialized certificates, Supervisory and Management certificates, Instructor certificates, plus five states reporting other types of certificates.

MCOLES currently issues training certificates in each area; the present focus of the Strategic Plan component involving certification is on initial certification/licensing. With the models identified, the staff research team for this component will investigate a shared decision process for permanent licensing involving both MCOLES and the employing agency.

Issues to be considered will include authority to function as a law enforcement officer, required hours of supervised employment, and a qualitative evaluation of work experience while acting under limited licensure. Other issues will bear consideration, such as multiple employing agencies, due process considerations, and a concern among agencies to not require a formal field training program.

Continued Law Enforcement In-Service Training (Michigan and Standards Agency Surveys)

With nearly all reporting Michigan agencies indicating that in-service training is required or provided (97.5%), the agencies averaged slightly more than 40 hours per officer per year. Of the eight agencies reporting no in-service training, 5 were agencies categorized as very small (1-10 officers), two small agencies (11-29 officers) and medium-size agency (30-99 officers).

By agency size, medium-sized agencies averaged the most training per officer at 58.8 hours per year; by agency type, township agencies at 64.6 hours per year. The lowest average hours per officer reported were from small agencies, with 30.7 hours per year, and state agencies at 28.2 hours.

The Michigan agencies were also asked to list training topics considered to be of “core” importance, as well as recent training provided to their officers. The same nine topics clearly rose to the top of both lists, with only slight variation in the order between lists. These topics consist of the following:

- Firearms;
- Legal Updates;
- Emergency Vehicle Operations/Defensive Driving;
- First Aid/CPR/AED;
- Subject Control;
- Use of Force Scenarios;
- Hazardous Materials/Biohazards;
- Blood- and Air-borne Pathogens; and
- Domestic Violence.

The agencies also identified current/timely training topics; the top reported areas include terrorism awareness/response, hazardous materials/biohazard, incident command, internet/identity crimes, school/workplace violence, legal updates, diversity/profiling issues, alcohol and drugs, and weapons of mass destruction/explosives.

Listings of perceived priorities for Michigan Justice Training competitive grant funding were requested; responses took the form of either specific issues or training topics. While the training topics reflected the current/timely training topics, the issues included the funding of multiple-agency training consortia, small agency training, core training programs, agency funds available, and geographic availability of training.

Over half of the responding agencies reported participation in a training consortium; responses also indicated that most agencies provided continued law enforcement services through remaining and/or replacement officers while other officers were in training.

The standards agency survey responses indicated that 19 of 29 have an in-service mandate. The mandates varied from a set number of hours with no topics specified, specified topics with no hours, a combination of hours and topics, and/or skills qualifications. Some states had modified requirements for executive/management and specialty personnel.

The MCOLES staff will research a mandate involving both core topics (high-risk/low-frequency tasks) and an elective component to allow agency flexibility. Issues to be considered will involve linking the mandate to an officer's license and sanctions, sanctions for agencies that ignore mandated training requirements, costs and funding, availability and structure of core training delivery, including number and locations of training consortia, and executive/administrative core requirements.

Training Academy Accreditation (Standards Agency Survey)

State standards and training agencies were asked whether they have or are researching accreditation programs for their respective training academies. Eleven states indicated an accreditation program with four additional states researching the issue. Contact information was gathered from those states possessing or researching academy accreditation.

Waiver of Training Program (Limited Michigan Agency/Officer Survey)

The Waiver of Training program allows previously-Michigan certified officers and out-of-state certified officers to obtain Michigan certification without returning to a basic training session. It also provides pre-service academy graduates a second year of eligibility to gain employment as a law enforcement officer.

The survey revealed that less than one-third of those completing the program actually gain law enforcement employment (most candidates complete the program prior to seeking employment). The structure and qualifications for this program will be reviewed by MCOLES staff, to include the qualifications for the program, the curriculum and testing requirements, and the delivery system.

Issues to be considered include a possible requirement to be hired and screened prior to admittance to the program, the impact of an increased number of hours in the training curriculum, strengthened assessments in the skills areas, exceptions to the Waiver of Training program, and the retest policy.

Carry Concealed Weapons Training (Michigan Agency Survey)

With the passing of revised carry concealed weapons legislation in 2000 came additional funding for law enforcement training in this area. The Michigan agency survey provided an opportunity for agencies to provide input as to what they deemed relevant. The most requested training involved recommended procedures for separating a person from their weapon during an encounter. Individuals willing to assist in the development of training were identified.

Additional responses indicated that there have been limited problems with CCW holders and no appreciable increase in the numbers of contacts. The most prevalent problem was failure of the person to declare the possession of a weapon as required.

Table of Contents

Table of Figures	ii
Table of Appendices	iii
Introduction	1
Methodology	2
The Michigan Agency Survey	2
The State POST/Commission Survey	4
Results	5
Survey Response	5
Michigan Agency Survey	5
State POST/Commission Survey	5
Waiver of Training Survey	5
Selection and Employment Standards	6
Law Enforcement Certification.....	11
Initial Law Enforcement Certification	11
Advanced Law Enforcement Certification	11
Law Enforcement Training Academy Accreditation	12
Waiver of Training.....	12
Continued Law Enforcement In-Service Training.....	13
Agency Survey Responses	13
Core Training Topics	14
Timely Training Topics	15
Training Grant Priorities	15
Training Consortia	16
Training Budget and Related Costs	16
State Survey Responses	18
Differing Requirements and Alternative Methods of Compliance with Mandate.....	18
In-Service Mandate Revenue Sources	18
Mandate Reporting and Penalties	19
Carry Concealed Weapon Issues	19
Conclusions	21

Table of Figures

Figure:

1: Agency Survey Response Rate by Agency Type and Size.....	5
2: For the Standard Minimum Age 18	6
3: For the Standard Possess U.S. Citizenship	6
4: For the Standard Possess High School Diploma or GED.....	6
5: For the Standard No Prior Felony Convictions	7
6: For the Standard Possess Good Moral Character	7
7: For the Standard Possess Valid Michigan/In-State Driver License.....	7
8: For the Standard Free from Physical Defects/Chronic Diseases	7
9: For the Standard Possess Hearing within Listed Ranges.....	7
10: For the Standard Height and Weight in Relation.....	8
11: For the Standard Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities	8
12: For the Standard Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound, and in Possession of Extremities	8
13: For the Standard Possess Normal Color Vision.....	8
14: For the Standard Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye.....	8
15: For the Standard Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye.....	9
16: For the Standard Pass the MCOLES/State-Required Reading and Writing Examination.....	9
17: For the Standard Pass Physical Fitness Examination or Agency Equivalent Test.....	9
18: For the Standard Pass Certification Exam Following Basic Training.....	9
19: For the Standard Examination by a Licensed Physician.....	9
20: For the Standard Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records	10
21: For the Standard Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability	10
22: For the Standard Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances.....	10
23: Methods of Psychological Examination	10
24: Advanced Law Enforcement Certification Levels.....	12
25: Preparedness for Certification Exam and Law Enforcement Duties	13
26: Maximum Time Out of Service before Full Basic Training Required	13
27: Average In-Service Hours per Agency Size/Type.....	14
28: Core Training vs. Recent Training Provided	14
29: Reported Timely Training Topics.....	15
30: Grant Priorities – Training Issues and Topics	16
31: Consortia Participation by Agency Size and Type	16
32: Training Allotment per Officer.....	17
33: Cost per Hour of Training.....	17
34: Methods for Providing Continued Law Enforcement Services	17
35: Source of Funding for In-Service Training Mandates	18
36: CCW Training Methods Indicated by Agencies.....	20

Table of Appendices

Appendix A: Agency Survey Instrument

Appendix B: State POST/Commission Survey Instrument

Appendix C: 2002 Strategic Plan Survey Response

Michigan Agencies Responding by Type and Size	C-1
State Commission/POST Agencies Responding	C-1

Appendix D: Selection and Employment Standards

Agency Survey Results for the Standard:

Minimum Age 18	D-1
Possess U.S. Citizenship	D-7
Possess High School Diploma/GED	D-9
No Prior Felony Convictions	D-13
Possess Good Moral Character	D-15
Possess Valid Michigan Driver License	D-17
Free from Physical Defects, Chronic Diseases	D-19
Possess Hearing within Listed Ranges	D-21
Possess Height and Weight in Relation (Body Mass Index)	D-23
Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities	D-25
Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound, and in Possession of Extremities	D-27
Possess Normal Color Vision	D-28
Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye	D-30
Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye	D-32
Pass MCOLES Reading and Writing Examination	D-34
Examination by a Licensed Physician	D-36
Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records	D-38
Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability	D-39
Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances	D-40
Other Standards and Additional Comments on Existing Standards	D-42
Methods Required to Screen Candidates for Mental/Emotional Instabilities	D-46

State POST/Commission Survey Results for the Standard:

Minimum Age 18	D-48
Possess U.S. Citizenship	D-49
Possess High School Diploma/GED	D-50
No Prior Felony Convictions	D-52
Possess Good Moral Character	D-53
Possess Valid In-State Driver License	D-54
Free from Physical Defects, Chronic Diseases	D-55
Possess Hearing within Listed Ranges	D-56
Possess Height and Weight in Relation (Body Mass Index)	D-57

Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities	D-58
Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound, and in Possession of Extremities	D-59
Possess Normal Color Vision	D-60
Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye	D-61
Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye.....	D-62
Pass Reading and Writing Examination or Agency Equivalent	D-63
Pass Physical Fitness Exam or Agency Equivalent Test	D-64
Pass Certification Exam following Basic Training.....	D-65
Examination by a Licensed Physician	D-66
Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records	D-67
Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability	D-68
Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances	D-69
Other Standards and Additional Comments on Existing Standards	D-70
Methods Required to Screen Candidates for Mental/ Emotional Instabilities	D-71
States Requiring Psychological Screening for Non-Employed Police Recruits	D-73

Appendix E: Law Enforcement Certification

Issuance of Initial Certification.....	E-1
Advanced Certification Levels	E-6
POST Agencies Having or Researching Academy Accreditation.....	E-11

Appendix F: Waiver of Training

Program Results in Preparing for Certification Exam and Law Enforcement Officer Duties.....	F-1
Additional Classroom Training and Field Training Provided Upon Hire ...	F-2
Supervisor Response to Maximum Time out of Service	F-3

Appendix G: Continued Law Enforcement In-Service Training

Agency Survey Results:	
In-Service Training Reported	G-1
Average In-Service Hours by Agency Type and Size	G-2
Recent and Recommended Core Training Topics	G-4
Recent and Reported Timely Training Topics.....	G-7
Reported Recommendations for Grant Focus.....	G-10
Reported Training Consortia Listing	G-12
Reported Training Budgets	G-14
Methods for Providing Continued Law Enforcement Services	
While Officers in Training.....	G-15
Agencies Registering Courses or Using Computer Courses.....	G-16
Comments on In-Service Training.....	G-17

POST Survey Results:

States with In-Service Training Mandate	G-28
Differing In-Service Requirements and Methods of Compliance	G-32
In-Service Training Mandate Funding Sources	G-34
In-Service Mandate Reporting and Penalties.....	G-36
Mandated Curriculum Development and Presentation	G-38

Appendix H: Carry Concealed Weapon Issues:

CCW Materials Provided by MCOLES.....	H-1
CCW Encounters/Arrests.....	H-3
Separation of CCW Permit-Holders from Weapon	H-6
Additional CCW Training.....	H-7

Introduction

This report contains a summary of results from a two-part survey conducted in March 2002 researching law enforcement officer selection, employment, basic training, certification/licensure, and continued in-service training.

The Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards (MCOLES) developed and adopted a strategic planning initiative, through which to derive a multi-year strategy for continuing development of law enforcement standards and training in Michigan. This project began several years ago, at which time the staff and Commissioners underwent a professionally facilitated process to elicit best thoughts regarding a vision for the future. These sessions produced several groups of ideas, which eventually formed the conceptual basis for a strategic plan. This information was then presented to the law enforcement community across the state in various forums, including Town Hall Meetings and professional conferences. Based on the input received from the field, the proposed components were adjusted and further developed until the final conceptual design took shape, as presented below:

- **Modernization of Law Enforcement Training.** Michigan's delivery system for law enforcement training has come a long way since its inception. Yet, modern learning technology now offers methodologies that promise substantial improvement in skill development and in the retention and application of knowledge. To take advantage of these advances, fundamental changes in MCOLES philosophy and practices have to be worked out. This will entail a complete review of training standards, with a shifting emphasis from process oriented management to an outcome-oriented approach, placing greater emphasis on candidate evaluation, and replacing oversight with academy accreditation.
- **Enhancement of Law Enforcement Certification.** Clients need to conduct MCOLES business in an uncomplicated, user-friendly environment. The present paper-based certification process does not always meet this standard. Streamlined MCOLES services will migrate to reliable, paperless transactions, utilizing modern information technology. During this process, selection standards will come under review. Ultimately, MCOLES must consider the duration of law enforcement certification and levels of training and/or experience.
- **Development of In-Service Training.** One of the clearest messages received from the field during the 2000 Town Hall Meetings was the desire to move forward with an in-service training standard. Thirty-seven other states now require some form of in-service training for incumbent law enforcement officers. Turning this concept into reality would entail a linkage of MCOLES standards with the Justice Training Fund as well as an improved course tracking system.

With the appointment of a new 15-member panel in November 2001, the new Commissioners embraced the conceptual design for this strategic plan. The next phase would be to conduct research to assist in detailing the implementation options for each component of the plan.

Methodology

One of the first steps in the research to be conducted in furtherance of the Strategic Plan Initiative consisted of a two-part survey. One instrument was used to determine the needs and opinions of the Michigan law enforcement agencies that would be affected by any changes in selection, training and certification requirements (see Appendix A). The second instrument was used to determine the requirements of other states' law enforcement standard-setting agencies, either as alternate approaches or to determine national trends which have already been researched and supported (see Appendix B).

The surveys were mailed to the agencies and states on March 5, 2002, with a requested return date of March 25; the return date was extended to April 12 to include a large number of additional responses that were received following the requested return date.

The Michigan Agency Survey

The Michigan agency survey was mailed to 699 entities, representing the 628 active law enforcement agencies in the state, plus the state police district headquarters and post details. The state police sub-units were included to determine local needs, as they are situated about the states serving diverse populations. The Michigan agency survey consisted of three separate sections:

- Selection and Employment Standards;
- In-Service Training; and
- CCW Training.

The first two items dealt specifically with the Strategic Plan components of developing in-service training and enhancement of law enforcement certification. The third segment on CCW training was included to gauge the effect of a new concealed weapons law and the potential training issues that have surfaced since the new law was effected.

In addition to the survey sent to all Michigan agencies, a prior 2002 survey had been sent to those agencies that had hired candidates from the Waiver of Training program, and those candidates who had completed the program and succeeded in gaining employment as a certified law enforcement officer.

The Waiver of Training program serves the purpose of re-certifying previous Michigan law enforcement officers returning to law enforcement following a break in service and out-of-state certified officers seeking law enforcement employment in Michigan. The program also extends the eligibility for certification of Michigan academy pre-service graduates who have not yet gained a certified law enforcement position. The results of this survey also pertain to the Modernization of Law Enforcement Training element, so are also included herein.

The first part of the agency survey included demographic data on the agency, including agency type (e.g. municipal police department, sheriff's department, etc.), agency size,

number of full-time and part-time employees. This information would be used to determine if any differing responses were related to agency characteristics.

The remainder of Part I assessed the current state of the agency's in-service training requirements (hours and topics provided, means of training delivery, etc.). This section also considered the agency's determination of what training topics should be considered those critical "core" topics requiring continued refresher training and "timely" training topics that may be of immediate relevance for training. The final part of this section assessed the agency's opinion of the issues the Commission should consider in the awarding of the Justice Training Fund's competitive grant process.

Part II of the agency survey listed each of the MCOLES mandated selection and employment standards, asking the respondent whether that standard was currently appropriate and/or relevant to law enforcement officer selection and any comments on each. Two of the selection and employment standards were not considered in this survey. The MCOLES physical skills pre-employment test was under review with the possibility of replacing the pre-employment test with a fitness-based curriculum and test as a part of the basic training process, so it was excluded to avoid creating confusion in the field. The other excluded standard was the law enforcement certification examination, which is required of all law enforcement candidates prior to certification, and was determined to be inappropriate to question the field in this area. This part of the survey also attempted to assess the methods used to screen candidates to the standard of mental and emotional stability.

The third segment of the agency survey related to the passing of Carry Concealed Weapon (CCW) legislation in 2000 (Public Act 381 of 2000). The Act included a law enforcement training fund derived from CCW application fees. This was included on the survey to determine the law's impact on the law enforcement field, and training issues that may have arisen due to encounters with an increased number of CCW holders.

The purpose of the separate survey on the Waiver of Training program was as part of a review of that process, including eligibility for the program and program content. It should be noted that most candidates have one year from the first attempt at the certification exam to gain employment as a certified law enforcement officer, so not all of the candidates' eligibility had expired at the time of the survey. Once the employed Waiver candidates were identified, a survey was sent to those officers and their supervisors to comment on the program and the level of preparation gained by the program, i.e. the program's effectiveness.

The State POST/Commission Survey

The state survey was sent to the other 48 states with a POST/Commission organization, plus the District of Columbia and the Honolulu Police Department (the largest agency in that state as Hawaii has no state standards organization). The state survey consisted of four sections:

- Selection and Employment Standards;
- Law Enforcement Certification;
- In-Service Training; and
- Training Academy Accreditation.

These sections all relate to the Strategic Plan components, and where possible attempted to mirror the questions of the Michigan agency survey, so that the agency responses could be considered in light of the other states' current practices.

The first part, selection and employment standards, was the closest in form to the agency survey, in that each of the Michigan standards were listed. Rather than asking if the standards were appropriate, the states were asked to identify if a same or similar standard existed in that state. The two items omitted from the agency survey, the physical fitness test and certification exam, were included in the states survey. The states were also asked to identify any other selection and employment standards used. As with the agency survey, the other states were asked to identify how compliance with a psychological standard is assessed, and if pre-employment candidates were allowed to attend training, how the specific issue of Americans with Disabilities Act conditions were met.

Part II of the state survey dealt with the certification or licensure of law enforcement officers, both at initial and continuing/advanced certification levels. The first segment, regarding initial certification, focused on whether certification is issued in steps, requirements for attaining full certification, and level of authority until full certification. The second segment dealt with advanced levels of certification such as advanced police officer, supervisory, management, or instructor certifications.

The third part investigated the other states' continued in-service training requirements, both in hours and specific topic areas. Development of mandated in-service training curricula and funding for mandates was also addressed.

Part IV of the state survey, for the Modernization of Law Enforcement Training portion of the MCOLES Strategic Plan, inquired as to whether the states had or were researching an accreditation process for their basic law enforcement training academies.

Results

Survey Response

Michigan Agency Survey

Of the 699 surveys mailed to the Michigan law enforcement agencies and state police posts and districts, a total of 324 were returned, for an overall response rate of 46.4 %. Three surveys were returned as undeliverable. See Figure 1 for a breakdown of agency type and size responding.

Figure 1: Agency Survey Response Rate by Agency Type and Size

Size Type	1-10	11-29	30-99	100-200	200+	Returned	Mailed	Percent
College/Univ	4	6	3			13	22	59.1 %
Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45	83	54.2 %
Municipal	90	57	27	10	2	186	374	49.7 %
Township	24	16	10			50	117	42.7 %
State	1	8	4		10	23	74	31.1 %
Other	3	3	1			7	29	24.1 %
Total	<i>121</i>	<i>110</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>314</i>	<i>699</i>	46.4 %

State POST/Commission Survey

Of the 48 states, District of Columbia, and Honolulu Police Department surveys mailed, 29 were returned. A response was also entered for Michigan, for inclusion in the results. This gives a final figure of 30 out of 51 possible responses, or 58.8 %. States responding can be found in Appendix C.

Waiver of Training Survey

It was found that only 60 people who completed Waiver of Training in the 15-month period selected had gained employment as certified law enforcement officers. Of the 261 who attended the program and/or testing, it was found that 117 of these were actually those who returned for retests, mainly in the firearms qualification. This leaves an actual total of 144 individuals who successfully completed the Waiver process, thus the 60 individuals equates to only 41 % actually gaining employment as of the time of the survey.

Since there were 64 instances of employment for the 60 who were hired (due to multiple agencies reporting employment), the supervisor survey was sent to each of the 64 agencies and all 60 officers. Four of these were returned with indications that the individual no longer worked for that agency. A total of 41 completed supervisor responses were returned, or 64.1 %. Of the officer surveys, 33 were returned, or 55.0 %.

Selection and Employment Standards

As noted in the methodology, the selection and employment sections of the agency and state surveys were the most similar, with each standard listed individually on both surveys. The agencies were asked to respond if the standard is appropriate/relevant, and the states were asked if they had the same or a similar standard. Results for each are considered in the figures below. For each standard, tables for agency responses by type and size, specific states reporting, and comments can be found in Appendix D.

Figure 2: For the Standard Minimum Age 18

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	219	67.6 %	105	32.4 %
States	13	43.3 %	17	56.7 %

For the minimum age standard, it should be noted that there were a large number of comments, from both agencies and states, indicating that the age should be higher; most such responses indicated a minimum age of 21. However, a large number of those commenting that the age should be higher indicated a positive response that the standard was appropriate, contrary to their comments.

Figure 3: For the Standard Possess U.S. Citizenship

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	322	99.4 %	2	0.6 %
States	25	83.3 %	5	16.7 %

Figure 4: For the Standard Possess High School Diploma or GED

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	280	86.4 %	44	13.6 %
States	29	96.7 %	1	3.3 %

For this minimum education standard, it should be noted that for Michigan pre-service candidates who sponsor themselves through a basic training academy, a minimum of an associate degree is required prior to or upon completion of the basic training program. Only those hired and sponsored through training by a Michigan law enforcement agency are allowed an exemption from the associate degree requirement. This exception allows an agency the ability to expand their hiring pool if they find additional candidates. This is especially important in those economically depressed areas where such a degree requirement may cause adverse impact on the available candidates. This associate degree requirement also impacts on the minimum age standard, as a high school graduate continuing on to an associate degree would usually have attained age 20 prior to becoming eligible for training.

Figure 5: For the Standard No Prior Felony Convictions

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	320	98.8 %	4	1.2 %
States	29	96.7 %	1	3.3 %

Figure 6: For the Standard Possess Good Moral Character

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	321	99.1 %	3	0.9 %
States	25	83.3 %	5	16.7 %

Figure 7: For the Standard Possess Valid Michigan/In-State Driver License

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	320	98.8 %	4	1.2 %
States	19	63.3 %	11	36.7 %

Figure 8: For the Standard Free from Physical Defects/Chronic Diseases

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	309	95.4 %	15	4.6 %
States	22	73.3 %	8	26.7 %

For this standard and all standards with a physical requirement, per the Americans with Disabilities Act, the requirements pertain only to the candidate’s ability to perform the essential job functions as defined in Michigan’s job task analysis for law enforcement officers. A number of comments were received that these standards should be taken on a case-by-case basis, which is in fact the practice of MCOLES.

Figure 9: For the Standard Possess Hearing within Listed Ranges

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	318	98.1 %	6	1.9 %
States	15	50.0 %	15	50.0 %

**Figure 10: For the Standard Height and Weight in Relation
(per the Body Mass Index Scale)**

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	297	91.7 %	27	8.3 %
States	6	20.0 %	24	80.0 %

For this standard, the Body Mass Index (BMI) scale is used to ensure a standardized measure. For Michigan, an individual’s BMI must be below 35. This index rating is not used as a strict disqualifier; rather those failing the BMI standard are required to pass a cardio-vascular stress test at 12 METS.

Figure 11: For the Standard Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	320	98.8 %	4	1.2 %
States	26	86.7 %	4	13.3 %

**Figure 12: For the Standard Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound
and in Possession of Extremities**

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	319	98.5 %	5	1.5 %
States	17	56.7 %	13	43.3 %

Figure 13: For the Standard Possess Normal Color Vision

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	298	92.0 %	26	8.0 %
States	15	50.0 %	15	50.0 %

Figure 14: For the Standard Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	308	95.1 %	16	4.9 %
States	10	33.3 %	20	66.7 %

Figure 15: For the Standard Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	313	96.6 %	11	3.4 %
States	13	43.3 %	17	56.7 %

**Figure 16: For the Standard Pass the MCOLES/
State-Required Reading and Writing Examination**

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	320	98.8 %	4	1.2 %
States	13	43.3 %	17	56.7 %

**Figure 17: For the Standard Pass Physical Fitness Examination
or Agency Equivalent Test**

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	N/A		N/A	
States	20	66.7 %	10	33.3 %

As noted in the methodology, the physical fitness and certification exam standards were not included on the agency survey.

Figure 18: For the Standard Pass Certification Exam following Basic Training

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	N/A		N/A	
States	19	63.3 %	11	36.7 %

Figure 19: For the Standard Examination by a Licensed Physician

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	320	98.8 %	4	1.2 %
States	26	86.7 %	4	13.3 %

Figure 20: For the Standard Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	322	99.4 %	2	0.6 %
States	28	93.3 %	2	6.7 %

Figure 21: For the Standard Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	321	99.1 %	3	0.9 %
States	16	53.3 %	14	46.7 %

Figure 22: For the Standard Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances

	“Yes” Responses	“Yes” Percentage	“No” Responses	“No” Percentage
Agencies	323	99.7 %	1	0.3 %
States	14	46.7 %	16	53.3 %

Agencies were also asked to identify other standards for consideration or other comments on the selection and employment standards. States were asked to indicate other standards used by their state for selection and employment. These can be found in Appendix D.

The standard regarding mental and emotional instability for Michigan is currently allowed to be performed by either a physician or licensed psychologist. Both agencies and states were asked to identify those methods and standards used to gauge whether a candidate meets this qualification. See figure 23 below.

Figure 23: Methods of Psychological Evaluation

	Physician	Licensed Psychologist	Face-to-Face Interview	IACP Standards	IADLEST Standards	Standardized Tests
Agencies	134	184	184	5	1	50
States	9	14	9	1	0	8

A breakdown of agencies by type and size, states reporting the methods, and comments may also be found in Appendix D, along with comments from states that require psychological screening from pre-employment training candidates.

Law Enforcement Certification

The issues addressed in this section were only included in the state POST/Commission surveys, as Michigan agencies only have the present MCOLES certification process available.

Initial Law Enforcement Certification

Four questions were posed regarding the issuance of initial law enforcement certification. The questions were progressive, such that only those answering yes to each of the first two could proceed to the next: does the state certify/license officers; is the certification issued in steps; and whether the officer has full authority until full certification is reached. The fourth question in the set identified those requirements that must be met before full authority is granted.

Of the 30 states reporting, 27 issue certification/licenses. Nine of the states issue initial certification in steps, requiring probation periods, field training, etc. Seven of those 9 reported that the candidate has full law enforcement authority during the interim certification period.

The states were also asked to identify which agencies are involved in the issuance of certification/licensure. A number of states indicated multiple levels of approval necessary, such as endorsement by a law enforcement employer in addition to state or commission approval. For the 30 states responding: 12 indicated state involvement; 19 indicated POST/commission involvement; 7 indicated employer involvement, and one indicated other agency involvement (Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council).

Advanced Law Enforcement Certification

The state survey also asked respondents to identify other certification levels available following the issuance of initial law enforcement certification. These ranged from advanced levels of police officer certification, supervisory and management certification, and specialized or instructor certification. Totals of states indicating the availability of these certification levels are listed in Figure 24.

Responses by state for each of the law enforcement certification questions, as well as additional comments on the questions or law enforcement certification can be found in Appendix E.

Figure 24: Advanced Law Enforcement Certification Levels

Type of Certification/ License Available	Number of States Reporting
Intermediate Officer	9
Advanced Officer	11
Specialized Certificate	4
Supervisory	9
Management/Executive	9
Instructor	18
Other	6

Law Enforcement Training Academy Accreditation

Part IV of the state survey, regarding accreditation of law enforcement training academies, consisted of the single question to assemble a resource listing of states that have or are researching this type of program. As it relates to law enforcement certification (through the basic training process), the results are included here.

Twelve of the responding states indicated a current accreditation program for training academies, while an additional four are in the process of researching this area. A listing of those states and contact information is listed in Appendix E.

Waiver of Training

The Waiver of Training program relates to law enforcement officer certification, in that it is the means by which previously Michigan certified officers can regain their certification after it has lapsed, out-of-state officers can transfer certification to Michigan, and pre-service training students can extend their eligibility for initial certification. There were no significant problems reported with the training sites themselves, in facilities or instruction.

The Waiver candidates who completed the full program were asked how well the course prepared them for the certification exam and how well it prepared them for their law enforcement duties in Michigan. Their responses were compared to their supervisors' ratings of how well prepared they felt the candidates to be. See Figure 25; the listing by Waiver candidate type is available in Appendix F.

Agencies that hired Waiver of Training candidates were asked to indicate if additional classroom training or field training was provided to the officers. Of the 39 responses for classroom training, 30 indicated that additional training was provided; the average number of hours was 47.4, with 4 being the least and 160 being the most provided. Of the 41 responses for field training, 26 indicated this training was provided; the average number of weeks was 9.5, with a minimum of 3 weeks and a maximum of 17 weeks.

Figure 25: Preparedness for Certification Exam and Law Enforcement Duties

	Very Well	Well	Somewhat	Minimally
Candidate: Prepared for Certification Exam	9	11	2	
Candidate: Prepared for Law Enforcement Duties	5	13	2	2
Supervisor: Prepared for Law Enforcement Duties	16	13	3	1

As one of the items under review by the Commission includes the timelines for certification, agencies were asked whether officers who had been separated from law enforcement employment should have a time limit before being required to attend a full basic law enforcement training program. Those that responded that there should be a time limit were asked what that limit should be.

Of the 39 responses received, 33 indicated that there should be a time limit, while 6 indicated that there should not. The range of time limits indicated by the agencies ranged from one year to 10 years, with an average of 3.1 years. See Figure 26 for the number of responses for each of the reported time limits.

Figure 26: Maximum Time Out of Service Before Full Basic Training Required

Limit (Years)	Number Responding
1	2
2	18
3	6
5	4
7	1
10	2
Total	33

Continued Law Enforcement In-Service Training

Agency Survey Responses

In order to determine the impact of an in-service training mandate on Michigan law enforcement agencies, a number of questions were posed regarding agencies' current training levels provided, designation of "core" training topics and availability of continued training resources.

Of the 324 agencies responding, 316, or 97.5 %, indicated that their agency required or provided in-service training opportunities, while only 8 indicated they did not (2.5 %). Of those indicating no required or provided training, 5 were small agencies with 1-10 officers, 2 were agencies with 11-29 officers, and one was a state agency with 30-99 officers.

The overall average for agencies requiring or providing in-service to their officers was reported at 40.1 hours per officer. If an agency reported a range of hours provided per

officer, such as 16-32 hours, the lower figure was used so as to gain the minimum average figures. See Figure 25 for averages per agency size and type. For a further breakdown of agency sizes and types reporting providing in-service training, as well as average hours and minimum and maximum hours reported, see Appendix G.

Figure 27: Average In-Service Hours per Agency Size/Type

Agency Type	Size	1-10	11-29	30-99	100-200	201+	Average per Agency Type
College/University		22.7	21.6	48.0			30.8
Municipal		32.3	41.2	53.1	45.4	28.0	40.0
Other		40.0	60.0	60.0			53.3
Sheriff		23.0	29.1	42.8	34.7	48.0	35.5
State		24.0	30.7	32.5		25.8	28.2
Township		42.1	35.4	116.4			64.6
Average per Size		30.7	36.3	58.8	40.1	33.9	40.1

For the below questions regarding reported training topics for recent, core, and timely training, as well as grant priorities, with the wide variety and names of courses, the responses were categorized into 32 broad topics.

Core Training Topics

When the reported training provided recently by Michigan agencies is compared to their assessment of what topics should be considered core training for continued certification, the top nine items are remarkably similar, after which the number of agencies providing or recommending as core training falls sharply. The full list is available in Appendix G with a listing of reported availability for the recommended core topics by both agency size and type; the top nine topics and agencies reporting appear in Figure 26 below. These were rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 5, with 5 representing readily available and 1 representing not available.

Figure 28: Core Training vs. Recent Training Provided

Rank	Core Topic	Agencies	Recent Training	Agencies
1	Firearms	277	Firearms	261
2	Legal Update	254	Legal Update	239
3	EVO/Defensive Driving	185	First Aid/CPR/AED	204
4	First Aid/CPR/AED	177	Subject Control	161
5	Subject Control	168	EVO/Defensive Driving	112
6	Use of Force-Scenarios	72	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	90
7	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	61	Blood/Airborne Pathogens	85
8	Blood/Airborne Pathogens	55	Use of Force-Scenarios	59
9	Domestic Violence	46	Domestic Violence	49

Timely Training Topics

Agencies were also asked to identify timely training topics. These represent those areas, while outside of core training, that are pertinent to modern law enforcement in which additional training would be especially useful to agencies. The areas identified may be considered as reaction to recent events or anticipated events. Terrorist attacks, increasing school and workplace violence, and new crimes due to evolving technology are among the top issues. The availability of these training issues were also rated on a Likert scale from 1 to 5, with 5 representing readily available and 1 representing not available. The top nine issues are reported below (the tenth-ranked item was the category of “other,” and further responses dropped off in agencies reporting). The full listing of reported timely training topics can be found in Appendix G.

Figure 29: Reported Timely Training Topics

Rank	Topic	Agencies
1	Terrorism Awareness/Response	150
2	Hazardous Materials/Biohazards	55
3	Incident Command	49
4	Internet/Identity Crimes	48
5	School/Workplace Violence	45
(tie)	Legal Updates	45
7	Diversity/Profiling Issues	42
8	Alcohol/Drugs	36
9	Weapons of Mass Destruction/ Explosives	30

Training Grant Priorities

Included in the consideration of in-service training in Michigan was the topic of grant priorities. Of Michigan’s Justice Training Fund, 60 % is distributed to agencies on an officer per-capita basis for training. The remaining 40 %, less fund administrative costs, are distributed through a competitive grant process. To assist the new Commission with prioritizing grant funding, agencies were requested to rank order topics they felt were a training priority.

Respondents answered this question in two manners: some agencies indicated training issues (funding, availability, etc.) while others indicated specific course topic areas. As with the training courses, it was necessary to categorize the responses to training issues; the top eight responses for each are listed below; the full results can be found in Appendix G.

Figure 30: Grant Priorities – Training Issues and Topics

Rank	Issue	#	Topic	#
1	Consortium/Multiple Agency	35	Legal Updates/Issues	35
2	Small Agency Training/Funding	28	Terrorism Awareness	34
3	History of Grant Course	23	EVO/Defensive Driving	34
4	Core Training Programs	18	Firearms Training	18
5	Agency Training Funding	15	Use of Force-Scenarios	16
6	Special Enforcement Projects	14	Domestic Violence	15
7	Geographic Availability of Training	13	Incident Command	14
8	Direct Funding to Agencies	11	Evidence Training	14

Training Consortia

Agencies were asked to report whether they participated in a training consortium; this was to help determine the coverage of the state by such cooperative training efforts. Of the 324 agencies that responded 172, or 53.1 % reported participation in a training consortium. See Figure 29 for participation by agency type and size. A total of 27 consortia were identified, though one was in Indiana and two appeared to be private vendors.

Figure 31: Consortia Participation by Agency Size and Type

Agency Type	Size	1-10	11-29	30-99	100-200	201+	Total per Agency Type
College/University		2	3				5
Municipal		43	39	18	7	1	108
Other		1	2				3
Sheriff		3	18	7	5	1	34
State			3			1	4
Township		8	6	4			18
Total per Size		57	71	29	12	3	172

Training Budgets and Related Costs

Agencies were requested to indicate their annual training budget *excluding* monies received from the Justice Training Fund. Agencies not reporting their budget or actual number of employees were excluded from calculations. State agencies were also excluded, as the results included a number of state police posts and districts operating from the same training budget.

The figures in Figure 30 represent a rough estimate, as agencies may have reported the training budget including differing items, such as actual cost of training, or including travel, meals, etc.

Figure 32: Training Allotment per Officer

Total Full Time	Total Part Time	Total Budgets	Average per Officer
6,722	536	\$2,856,258	\$393.53

The reported budget and number of officers, plus the reported required or provided training figures were also used to calculate an estimate of cost per training hour (see Figure 31). Again, this is a rough estimate, as agencies may include different expenditures within their training budgets.

Figure 33: Cost per Hour of Training

Total Training Hours	Total In-Service Budgets	Average Cost per Hour
285,872	\$2,303,776	\$8.06

Note: The total in-service budget figures differ between the tables, as some records were not included in both calculations due to null values, such as hours trained, number of officers, etc.

The agencies were also asked to report the means by which continued law enforcement services were provided while officers were in training. Agencies could select from more than one of the following: remaining officers handle increased workload, replacement officers are paid overtime, officers are reassigned from within the agency, another law enforcement agency provides services, or other options. See Figure 32.

Figure 34: Methods for Providing Continued Law Enforcement Services

Remaining Officers	Replacement Officers	Officers Reassigned	Another Agency	Other
222	129	33	50	28

A full breakdown of average training allotment, cost, and provisions for continued service per agency size and type can be found in Appendix G. Responses to three miscellaneous questions on continued in-service training are also included in the appendix: a count of agencies registering in-service training courses with MCOLES, a count of agencies using computer-based training courses, and other comments on in-service training.

State Survey Responses

Of the 30 state surveys returned, 20 indicated a statewide in-service training mandate, while 10 did not. However, 6 of those reporting no mandate otherwise indicated a minimal level of required courses.

Specific state reporting as well as mandates per time period and specific courses can be found in Appendix G.

Differing Requirements and Alternative Methods of Compliance with Mandate

The states were asked about differing in-service training requirements for managers and executives or for any special functions officers (e.g. reserves, court officers). Five states reported a differing requirement for managers and executives. Four states also indicated special duty officers with differing requirements.

The use of computer-based training or college courses to satisfy an in-service training mandate was also reported. Sixteen states indicated that computer courses are allowed, where 14 states do not include this type of training. Twelve states allow the use of college credits to satisfy the requirements; 18 do not.

In-Service Mandate Revenue Sources

The states were asked to provide information on funding sources for in-service training, or who was ultimately responsible for funding mandated training. States were also asked to identify the nature of any funds provided through special assessments. See Figure 33 below. The states were allowed to select more than one source. For a state-by-state listing of funding sources, with comments on special assessment sources, see Appendix G.

Figure 35: Source of Funding for In-Service Training Mandates

Funding Source	States Reporting
Agency Responsibility	10
Individual Officer Responsibility	6
General Fund	5
Special Assessment	7
Restricted Fund	4
Traffic Enforcement Fines	6
Criminal Conviction Fines	2

Mandate Reporting and Penalties

The states were asked to indicate how mandated in-service training is reported to the POST/Commission agency, and if the mandate is not met, what penalties may be assessed. The responses by state for these may be found in Appendix G.

Carry Concealed Weapon Issues

Questions were posed as part of the agency survey, as described in the methodology, to determine enforcement and training issues since revised Carry Concealed Weapon (CCW) legislation was passed in 2000.

Prior to the survey, MCOLES had distributed training materials and a videotape to law enforcement agencies to assist with the understanding of the new laws. Of the agencies responding, 264 reported having reviewed these materials (81.5 %), while 50 reported that they had not reviewed the materials (18.5 %). A number of those reporting that they had not reviewed the materials indicated that the materials were not received.

Of those having reviewed the materials, 114 indicated that they had been very useful (43.2 %), 144 indicated the material was somewhat useful (54.5 %), and 7 indicated that it was not very useful (2.7 %). The responses by agency type and size are included in Appendix H.

An issue of much debate statewide when the new legislation was passed was the possibility of an increase in CCW encounters once the permits were more readily obtainable. Of the 324 agencies responding, 47 (14.5 %) indicated an increase since July 2000, when the legislation passed (although several respondents indicated that this may be attributable to a delay in processing applications, thus the number of permit-holders has not yet increased). Fifteen of the agencies (4.6 %) reported specific problems on CCW encounters. A total of 45 agencies responding indicated that their officers had made arrests under the new legislation (13.9 %).

One training issue of concern is when officers are allowed to separate a permit-holder from their weapon. When asked if their agency has a policy or custom of separating permit-holders from their weapon, 58 (17.9 %) indicated that they do. However, when asked if the policy/custom allowed separation on all encounters or on reasonable suspicion only, 115 agencies (35.5 %) indicated one of the options. Ninety-six of those responding indicated that officers could separate on reasonable suspicion only, while 19 indicated that this occurred on all CCW encounters.

As funding is available through the legislation for continued law enforcement training in CCW areas, the agencies were asked to indicate what methods of training were most desired by their agency. The agencies could select from any of five methods, or indicate any other requested form of training. See Figure 34.

Figure 36: CCW Training Methods Indicated by Agencies

Agency Type	Additional Videos	Regional Training	Tele-Conference	Written Materials	Instructor Training	Other Training
College/Univ.	10	6	0	5	4	1
Municipal	103	61	4	90	75	6
Other	4	1	0	3	3	0
Sheriff	20	9	0	17	12	3
State	10	4	1	11	4	0
Township	31	17	0	20	12	0
Total	178	98	5	146	110	10

Comments on CCW training issues are included in Appendix H. A listing of individuals willing to assist in the development of additional training material was also gathered.

Conclusions

As this survey was designed as part of the initial research into the Strategic Plan areas to be developed, the results serve as a means to identify those areas that will require further investigation. Therefore, any conclusions at this time would be premature.

However, it should be noted that a large number of responses from Michigan agencies appear to be the results of misinformation in the field regarding the true nature of the MCOLES selection and employment standards, training and certification processes. These standards are reflections of the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards' mission and values that drive the organization. Every attempt should be made while researching and considering these issues that the law enforcement organizations, officers, and customers are fully aware of the meaning and rationale for each standard set in place.

Appendices

Appendix A:
Agency Survey Instrument

Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Part I: Officer In-Service Training

The Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards has been charged by Governor Engler in Executive Order 2001-5 to "...focus its activities in order to accomplish the following objectives involving law enforcement organizations and officers:

1. Increase professionalism;
2. Increase the number of law enforcement organizations that offer formal in-service training and increase the number of law enforcement officers who receive formal in-service training;
3. Institute law enforcement in-service training standards applicable to all law enforcement in-service training in Michigan."

With the Governor's focus, and the strategic direction adopted by the Commission, the MCOLES staff is researching the status of in-service training presently provided by Michigan law enforcement agencies. Also, please share this portion of the survey with your training coordinator for their input.

1. Agency Type:

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Municipal | <input type="checkbox"/> Township | <input type="checkbox"/> Sheriff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> College/University | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

2. Number of Certified Officers:

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 11-29 | <input type="checkbox"/> 30-99 | <input type="checkbox"/> 100-200 | <input type="checkbox"/> 201+ |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|

2a. How many of the officers are: Full-time _____ Part-time _____

3. Does your agency belong to or participate in a regional law enforcement training consortium?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

3a. If yes, please provide contact information for the consortium:

Consortium Name: _____
Consortium Coordinator: _____
Contact Number: _____

4. Does your agency require/provide in-service training for your certified officers?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

4a. If yes, approximately how many hours per officer are required or provided per year?

_____ hours

☐ Yes ☐ No

\$_____

- ☐ Remaining officers handle increased workload.
- ☐ Replacement officers are paid overtime.
- ☐ Officers are reassigned from other sections within the agency.
- ☐ Services are provided by another law enforcement agency.
- ☐ Other: _____

☐ Yes ☐ No

<u>Training Topic</u>	<u>Availability to your agency/officers</u>				
	<u>Not available</u>			<u>Readily available</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

9. Please list those training areas that you would consider to be “timely training” topics; that is, those areas of law enforcement that are new or especially appropriate for law enforcement officers to be trained in **at this time** (e.g. terrorism awareness training). Also, for each topic you list, please indicate on a scale of 1 to 5 how available that training is to your agency/officers, with 1 being “not available” and 5 being “readily available.”

<u>Training Topic</u>	<u>Availability to your agency/officers</u>				
	<u>Not available</u>			<u>Readily available</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

10. The new MCOLES Commission is reviewing the focus of the competitive grant process. Given the limited resources currently available for these grants (approximately \$3 million), please list the most important issues that you feel the Commission should consider for funding, in rank order:

11. Please indicate any additional comments you may have regarding in-service training standards for Michigan law enforcement officers. Also, please indicate how this relates to the issue of (or your experience with) failure to train lawsuits through Federal or State courts:

<p>Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards</p> <p>Part II: Officer Selection and Employment Standards</p>
--

As part of its long term strategic plan, the Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards expects to review each of the selection and employment standards required for certification as a Michigan law enforcement officer. For each of the current standards below, indicate whether you feel the standard is still relevant and appropriate for Michigan law enforcement officers. An additional fact sheet with additional information regarding the standards is enclosed.

For the standard:	Is it relevant/ appropriate:	Comments about or experience with the standard:
1. At least 18 years of age.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
2. Possess U.S. Citizenship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
3. High school diploma or GED.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
4. No prior felony convictions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
5. Possess good moral character.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
6. Possess a valid Michigan operator or chauffeur license.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
7. Be free from physical defects, chronic diseases, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
8. Hearing within listed ranges.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
9. Height and weight in relation to each other (as measured by body mass index scale).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
10. Free from mental and emotional instabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
11. Free from impediment of the senses, physically sound, and in possession of extremities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
12. Possess normal color vision.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
13. Possess 20/20 corrected vision in each eye.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

For the standard:	Is it relevant/ appropriate:	Comments about or experience with the standard:
14. Possess normal visual functions in each eye.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
15. Pass the MCOLES reading and writing examination or an approved agency equivalent test.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
16. Examination by a licensed physician to determine that the applicant meets all medical standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
17. Fingerprint the applicant with a search of state and federal fingerprint files to disclose criminal record.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
18. Conduct an oral interview to determine the applicant's acceptability.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
19. Cause the applicant to be tested for the illicit use of controlled substances.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

20. For standard number 10 above, that a candidate be free from mental and emotional instability, please indicate the method(s) by which your agency screens candidates:

- ☐ Physician
 ☐ Licensed Psychologist
☐ Face-to-face interview
 ☐ Standardized tests: _____
☐ IADLEST published standards
 ☐ IACP published standards

21. Are there any other selection and/or employment standards that you feel should be researched by MCOLES for possible inclusion in the requirements for law enforcement officer certification in Michigan?

<p>Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Part III: CCW In-Service Training</p>

As you are aware, Public Act 381 of 2000 established changes to Michigan's carrying of concealed weapons (CCW) laws. In part, this Act established a concealed weapon enforcement fund, which may be used "... only to provide training to law enforcement personnel regarding the rights and responsibilities of individuals who are licensed to carry concealed pistols in this state and proper enforcement techniques in light of those rights and responsibilities" (MCL 28.425v).

The Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards has been asked to administer this fund on behalf of the State. Accordingly, MCOLES is requesting your assistance developing CCW in-service training that will best suit the needs of law enforcement agencies in Michigan. This section of the survey asks about both the types of CCW enforcement training you would like to see provided, as well as the CCW issues your officers have encountered that may be of training interest to others. Also, please share this portion of the survey with your primary firearms instructor for their input.

1. Has your department reviewed the CCW officer training videotape and other CCW materials sent by MCOLES?

☐ Yes ☐ No

1a. If so, did your officers find these training materials:

☐ Very Useful ☐ Somewhat Useful ☐ Not Very Useful

2. Have your officers reported an increase in encounters with persons holding CCW permits since the new law took effect on July 1, 2001?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Since July 1, 2001, have your officers reported any specific problems on encounters with persons holding CCW permits or carrying weapons (e.g. misunderstandings with subjects, obtaining permit information from LEIN, control of the weapon, etc.)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3a. If so, please describe:

4. Does your agency have a policy or custom where officers temporarily separate a CCW permit-holder from their weapon during a stop or encounter?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4a. If so, do your officers take control of the weapon:

☐ On all CCW encounters ☐ On reasonable suspicion only (Terry stop)

5. Since July 1, 2001, have your officers made any arrests for violation of the CCW law?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. In your opinion, what CCW issues need to be developed for training?

7. What CCW enforcement training would be beneficial to your agency (check all that apply):

☐ Additional training videos ☐ Written materials
☐ Regional training sessions ☐ Instructor training
☐ Teleconference ☐ Other: _____

8. Would you or a representative from your agency be interested in assisting with the development of CCW enforcement training materials?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Name: _____ Contact Telephone: _____

10. Comments on the need for CCW enforcement training:

Thank you for your participation and input. Please return the survey to David Lee, MCOLES Career Development Section, 7426 N. Canal Road, Lansing, MI 48913.

Appendix B:
State POST/Commission
Survey Instrument

<p align="center">Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Part I: Officer Selection and Employment Standards</p>
--

The Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards is currently reviewing each of our selection and employment standards required for certification as a Michigan law enforcement officer. For each of the current standards below, please indicate whether your state has a similar standard, and comment on your experience with the standard or how yours differs from Michigan's. A fact sheet with additional information regarding the standards is enclosed.

For the standard:	Same/similar in your state:	Comments about or experience with the standard, or differing standard for your state:
1. At least 18 years of age.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
2. Possess U.S. Citizenship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
3. High school diploma or GED.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
4. No prior felony convictions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
5. Possess good moral character.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
6. Possess a valid Michigan operator or chauffeur license.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
7. Be free from physical defects, chronic diseases, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
8. Hearing within listed ranges.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
9. Height and weight in relation to each other (as measured by body mass index scale).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
10. Free from mental and emotional instabilities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
11. Free from impediment of the senses, physically sound, and in possession of extremities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
12. Possess normal color vision.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
13. Possess 20/20 corrected vision in each eye.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

For the standard:	Same/similar in your state:	Comments about or experience with the standard, or differing standard for your state:
14. Possess normal visual functions in each eye.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
15. Pass the MCOLES reading and writing examination or an approved agency equivalent test.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
16. Pass the MCOLES physical fitness examination or an approved agency equivalent test.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
17. Pass the MCOLES certification examination upon the completion of basic training.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
18. Examination by a licensed physician to determine that the applicant meets all medical standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
19. Fingerprint the applicant with a search of state and federal fingerprint files to disclose criminal record.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
20. Conduct an oral interview to determine the applicant's acceptability.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
21. Cause the applicant to be tested for the illicit use of controlled substances.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

20. For standard 10 above, that a candidate be free from mental and emotional instability, please indicate the method(s) by which your state requires candidates to be screened:

- ☐ Physician
 ☐ Licensed Psychologist
☐ Face-to-face interview
 ☐ Standardized tests: _____
☐ IADLEST published standards
 ☐ IACP published standards

21. Are there any other selection and/or employment standards that you feel should be researched by MCOLES for possible inclusion in the requirements for law enforcement officer certification in Michigan?

22. Do you require pre-academy psychological screening for **non-employed** police recruits (e.g. self-sponsored or college-based recruits)?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

24a. If yes, how is any potential conflict with the Americans with Disabilities Act resolved?

Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Part II: Graduated Certification
--

Michigan does not currently have a graduated licensing/certification process by which an officer would progress through levels of certification. This area is being researched for the possible development of such a system. Your input will assist in determining national trends in this area.

1. Does your state certify or license police officers?

☐ Yes ☐ No – please skip to Part III.

2. If yes to question 1, is certification/licensing issued in steps following training (e.g. “interim” progressing to full certification)?

☐ Yes ☐ No – please skip to question 5.

3. If yes to question 2, do the officers have full police authority during the interim period?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. If yes to question 2, what requirements must a training graduate meet before certification/licensure is granted (e.g. mandated field training program, probationary period, etc.)?

5. What entities must approve before full certification/licensure is granted?

☐ State ☐ Employer
☐ Commission ☐ Other: _____

6. Once certification/licensure is granted, is there a time restriction placed on how long their certification/license is valid?

☐ Yes: _____ ☐ No – please skip to question 8.

7. If yes to question 6, what requirements must be met before the certification is renewed?

8. Please indicate if any advanced levels of certification are available, and the requirements for obtaining each:

☐ Intermediate: _____

☐ Advanced: _____

☐ Specialized: _____

☐ Supervisory: _____

☐ Management/Executive: _____

☐ Instructor: _____

☐ Other: _____

9. Please indicate any comments you may have regarding graduated certification/ licensing that you feel may assist us in this project:

<p>Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Part III: Officer In-Service Training</p>

Michigan does not currently have an in-service training mandate for certified officers. The Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards was directed by Governor John Engler to research and implement in-service training standards for law enforcement officers. Your input will help us to determine national trends in this area.

1. Does your state mandate in-service training requirements for law enforcement officers?

☐ Yes ☐ No – please skip to Part IV.

2. If yes, how many hours per year/period?

_____ hours per _____ years

3. If specific courses or topic areas are required, please indicate the areas and required hours:

4. Do management and line officers have different training requirements?

☐ Yes ☐ No – please skip to question 5.

4a. If yes, how do they differ?

5. Do special duty officers have different training requirements (e.g. park rangers, reserves, marine patrol, etc.)?

☐ Yes ☐ No – please skip to question 6.

5a. If yes, how do they differ?

6. How is the training mandate funded?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility of agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility of officer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic enforcement revenues | <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal conviction revenues |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State general fund | <input type="checkbox"/> POST/Commission restricted fund |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special assessment | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

6a. If the funding source is a special revenue or assessment, please describe (e.g. \$5 added to traffic or criminal conviction):

7. Are there any penalties for non-compliance with the required training mandate?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No – please skip to question 8.

7a. If yes, please describe the penalties:

8. Do you use/allow computer-based courses to satisfy the training mandate or portions thereof (e.g. self-paced CD-ROM or internet courses)?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Do you allow college credits to satisfy the training mandate or portions thereof?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

10. How is training reported to the POST/Commission?

11. Who is responsible for developing the mandated curriculum?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> POST/Commission Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Agency providing training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor providing training | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

12. Are instructors required to be POST/Commission certified to present mandated training courses?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

<p>Michigan Commission on Law Enforcement Standards Part IV: Training Academy Accreditation</p>

1. Does your state have a police academy accreditation program in place, or are you currently researching police academy accreditation?

☐ Yes – currently have ☐ Yes – currently researching ☐ No

2. If yes to either option above, please list a contact person at your agency so we may discuss your approach to academy accreditation:

Name: _____

Position: _____

Telephone number: _____

Please indicate whom we may contact if we have additional questions about your responses to this entire survey:

Name: _____

Position: _____

Street Address: _____

City, State Zip: _____

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your cooperation will greatly assist us in our research endeavors.

Please indicate your state: _____

If you would like a copy of the results of this survey, please indicate a contact person and address:

Name: _____

Position: _____

Street Address: _____

City, State Zip: _____

***Please return this survey to David Lee, MCOLES Career Development Section, 7426
N. Canal Road, Lansing, MI 48913.***

Appendix C:
2002 Strategic Plan Survey Response

2002 Strategic Plan Survey Response:

Michigan Agencies Responding by Type and Size

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Returned</i>	<i>Out of</i>	<i>Percent</i>
College/University	4	6	3			13	22	59.1%
Municipal	90	57	27	10	2	186	374	49.7%
Other	3	3	1			7	29	24.1%
Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45	83	54.2%
State	1	8	4		10	23	74	31.1%
Township	24	16	10			50	117	42.7%
Total	125	114	55	17	13	324	699	46.4%

Note: Each State Police District and Post was included in the survey.

State Commission/POST Agencies Responding

1 Alaska	16 New Hampshire
2 Arizona	17 New Mexico
3 Arkansas	18 New York
4 California	19 North Carolina
5 District of Columbia	20 North Dakota
6 Florida	21 Ohio
7 Idaho	22 Oklahoma
8 Indiana	23 Oregon
9 Kansas	24 Texas
10 Kentucky	25 Utah
11 Maryland	26 Vermont
12 Michigan	27 Virginia
13 Minnesota	28 Washington
14 Missouri	29 Wisconsin
15 Nebraska	30 Wyoming

Appendix D:
Selection and Employment Standards

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Minimum Age 18

Is the Standard Minimum Age of 18 Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	2	3	1			6
	Municipal	66	35	18	6	2	127
	Other	1	2	1			4
	Sheriff	3	20	7	6		36
	State	1	3	1		7	12
	Township	17	11	6			34
Total		90	74	34	12	9	219
No	College/University	2	3	2			7
	Municipal	24	22	9	4		59
	Other	2	1				3
	Sheriff		4	3	1	1	9
	State		5	3		3	11
	Township	7	5	4			16
Total		35	40	21	5	4	105

Comments on Minimum Age of 18 Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

College/University

11-29

1 Youthful employees need lots of supervision.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 21
- 2 21 is more adequate.
- 3 Age should be 21 yrs of age.
- 4 However, 21 years of age is better for maturity and to understand the profession
- 5 I would set it at 21.
- 6 It should be 21.
- 7 Raise to 21.
- 8 Should be 21 - 18 is too young.
- 9 Should be 21 for all departments.
- 10 Should be 21 years
- 11 Should be 21.
- 12 Should be at least 21. 18 year olds have no life experience to prepare them for

- leadership roles.
- 13 Should be raised to 21 years of age.
- 14 Sometimes this seems to (sic) young.
-

11-29

- 1 21 would be better.
- 2 At least 21.
- 3 I feel 21 would be better.
- 4 Prefer 21 Min.
- 5 Should be 21 - legal age to purchase ammo.
- 6 Should be 21 - more mature
- 7 Should be 21+
- 8 Should be increased to 21.
-

30-99

- 1 Age is too young - lack of maturity.
- 2 Hiring standard - min 21 yrs of age.
- 3 Should be changed to 21 years of age.
-

100-200

- 1 21 + over.
- 2 21 should be minimum age - more maturity is needed.
- 3 21 YOA minimum.
- 4 Possibly raise to 21
- 5 Should be 21 years of age.
-

201+

- 1 Too young.
-

Sheriff

1-10

- 1 Good to use officers under 21 for furnishing charge.
-

11-29

- 1 Might consider increasing to 21 years old.
- 2 Possibly raise the age
- 3 The age should be 21
-

30-99

- 1 No maximum age.
-

100-200

- 1 Might look at 21 in lieu of the CCW law requiring age 21.
- 2 Should be 21 years old.
-

State

11-29

- 1 Should be 21. If can't drink, shouldn't be given authority to carry gun + take a life.
-

201+

- 1 Age should be increase to 21.
- 2 Maybe raise to 20-21
- 3 Our agency standard is 21 yoa.
- 4 Should be raised to 21

Township

1-10

- 1 At least 21 yrs. (minimum)
 - 2 Prefer the age of 21.
 - 3 Too young
 - 4 Would prefer age 21.
-

11-29

- 1 Can enforce liquor laws but cannot drink off duty!
-

30-99

- 1 18 is too young.
 - 2 18 is too young; should be at least 21 years of age.
 - 3 Yes, I actually believe the minimum age should be 21 because many applicants lack maturity at 18.
-

Comments on Minimum Age of 18 Relevant/Appropriate = No

College/University

1-10

- 1 21
 - 2 Should be at least 21 yrs.
-

11-29

- 1 Must be 21.
 - 2 Should be 21 yrs.
 - 3 Should be 21.
-

30-99

- 1 20 years old
 - 2 21 years or older
-

Municipal

1-10

- 1 21
- 2 21 years of age. Mature candidates.
- 3 21 years or older.
- 4 21 yrs older minimum
- 5 Age 21 years more appropriate.
- 6 At least 21
- 7 I believe 21 should be the standard. Life experience is too limited at 18.
- 8 I feel the minimum age for certified should be 21 yrs - issues with possession of alcohol.
- 9 I would not hire an officer less than 21.
- 10 It is debatable whether most 18 yr-olds are mature enough.
- 11 Like to see it 21.
- 12 Needs to be 21
- 13 Should be 21 years
- 14 Should be 21 yoa.
- 15 Should be 21.
- 16 Should be at least 19-21

- 17 Should be at least 21 years of age.
- 18 Should be at least 21.
- 19 Should be at least 21 yrs. Of age - maturity issue
- 20 Should be raised to 21.
- 21 Should raise limit to 21 years.
- 22 Some 18 year olds are more mature than 21 yrs.
- 23 Standard should be raised to 20 or 21 years of age.
- 24 Too low

11-29

- 1 18 is too young - the job is difficult enough for 21-22-23 yr old individuals
- 2 21 with advanced education.
- 3 21 years of age.
- 4 21 years.
- 5 Maturity level is not appropriate under 21.
- 6 Most 18 yr. old persons lack the maturity to deal with the issues facing law enforcement today. Mandatory 21 yrs.
- 7 Not less than 21 years.
- 8 Raise to 21 yrs. For certification. Do depts. hire under 21 years?
- 9 Should be 20
- 10 Should be 21
- 11 Should be 21 - I was hired at 20 - too young.
- 12 Should be 21 years - difficult sending someone in liquor establishment when their under age. Also, alcohol enforcement actually applies to them!
- 13 Should be 21 years of age.
- 14 Should be 21.
- 15 Standard should be 21 yoa.
- 16 Standard should be higher.
- 17 The age should be 22 due to the maturity issue.
- 18 To young and immature, change to 21
- 19 Too young - 21 years

30-99

- 1 21
- 2 21 years old
- 3 At least 21!
- 4 Lack of maturity.
- 5 Not less than 21.
- 6 Raise to 25 years.
- 7 Should be 21
- 8 Should be 21 if that is what we all actually do.

100-200

- 1 (--) Department's standard is 21 years of age.
- 2 21 years of age.
- 3 At least 21 yrs.
- 4 Minimum 21 yrs.

Other

1-10

- 1 21 yrs of age.
- 2 Should be 21.

11-29

- 1 21 yrs.

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 18 seems young for the responsibilities, maybe 21 would be better.
- 2 21
- 3 21 yoa.
- 4 At least 21 years old.

30-99

- 1 21 yrs is more applicable, more mature, experienced and probably more educated.
- 2 Should be 21 - maturity issue.
- 3 Should raise to 21 years

100-200

- 1 Should be 21 yoa.

201+

- 1 21 years

State

11-29

- 1 18 is too young. 21 is appropriate
- 2 21
- 3 If possible, raise to 21. Employment market is tight but maturity level needed for LE positions is critical.
- 4 Should be 21.
- 5 Should be at least 21 years old.

30-99

- 1 Should be 21
- 2 Should be 21.
- 3 Should be at least 21

201+

- 1 21 yrs of age is more appropriate.
- 2 Should be 21 years of age.
- 3 Should be 21.

Township

1-10

- 1 21 years of age minimum
- 2 21 years.
- 3 21 yoa minimum
- 4 21 yrs.
- 5 Should be 21.

11-29

- 1 19 years

- 2 At least 21.
 - 3 Should be 21
 - 4 Should be 21 years of age.
 - 5 Too young should be at least 21.
-

30-99

- 1 21 yrs. Old
 - 2 Inappropriate - life experiences of an 18 year old are not sufficient to perform law enforcement duties.
 - 3 Should be higher, I/e/ 21 yrs. Consider maturity level, career complexity, educational requirements.
 - 4 Should be raised to 21 - maturity issues
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess U.S. Citizenship

Is the Standard Possess U.S. Citizenship Relevant/Appropriate ?

		Agency Size				
Agency Type		1-10	11-29	30-99	100-200	201+ Total
Yes	College/University	4	6	3		13
	Municipal	90	56	26	10	2 184
	Other	3	3	1		7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1 45
	State	1	8	4		10 23
	Township	24	16	10		50
Total		125	113	54	17	13 322
No	Municipal		1	1		2
	Total		1	1		2

Comments on Possess U.S. Citizenship Relevant/Appropriate = Yes

College/University

11-29

1 Definitely.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Absolutely appropriate. We live in America and if you want to work here, you should be a citizen.
- 2 Must
- 3 Must have a vested interest in this country

11-29

1 Definite

30-99

1 Very important since 9-11.

100-200

1 Mandatory length - minimum 5 years.

State

201+

1 Absolute

Township

1-10

1 A must.

11-29

1 Absolutely

Comments on Possess U.S. Citizenship Relevant/Appropriate = No

Municipal

11-29

1 A permanent resident of Michigan could be a good police officer. I see no value in the citizenship issue.

30-99

1 In US legally; have satisfied all other legal requirements to work.

Agency Survey Results for Standard: High School Diploma/GED Required

Is the Standard High School Diploma or GED Required Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	2	6	1			9
	Municipal	81	46	23	9	2	161
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	22	8	6		39
	State	1	5	4		9	19
	Township	21	15	9			45
Total		111	97	46	15	11	280
No	College/University	2		2			4
	Municipal	9	11	4	1		25
	Sheriff		2	2	1	1	6
	State		3			1	4
	Township	3	1	1			5
Total		14	17	9	2	2	44

Comments on High School Diploma or GED Required Relevant/Appropriate = Yes

College/University

11-29

- 1 No GED - minimum of associate degree.
- 2 Requirement should be raised to minimum one year college.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 At a minimum.
- 2 At least.
- 3 College credits would be better.
- 4 High school diploma a must. GED: Not sure this addresses one's personal characteristics.
- 5 Higher preferred.
- 6 I feel education should be a priority.
- 7 Minimum entry level should be an associate degree.
- 8 Must
- 9 OK with a commitment to complete at least 2 yrs of college.
- 10 Possible 2 years of college.
- 11 Require associates degree. Bachelors after 10 years.
- 12 Should be minimum of 2 yrs college.

- 13 Should include minimum college credits equivalent to 2 year degree.
- 14 The absolute minimum. College is better, not so much in the law enforcement field itself, as that it demonstrates continued learning.
- 15 Yes, need educated people.

11-29

- 1 Associate Minimum (60 hours)
- 2 Base minimum. Should go to 2 yrs. of college.
- 3 College should be required.
- 4 More education.

30-99

- 1 Our department minimum is an AA. 90% have 4-year degree
- 2 Should have at least associates degree
- 3 Should require some college education.
- 4 We are requiring 60 hours college or pre-certified
- 5 We currently require 2 yrs.college.

100-200

- 1 Increase to college education
- 2 Preferably 60 hours.

Sheriff

1-10

- 1 Need this. A lot of applicants have difficulty spelling.

11-29

- 1 College associate degree
- 2 Should be higher
- 3 With current standards it should be associate degree.

30-99

- 1 Should be 2 yr college min.

100-200

- 1 Should include some college (2 yrs.)

State

11-29

- 1 If not higher
- 2 Should have to have at least an associates degree.
- 3 This is a minimum and some college should be included.

30-99

- 1 Minimum should be 2 years college.
- 2 Should have at least an associate degree.

201+

- 1 High School diploma

Township

1-10

- 1 High school diploma a must; would like to have 2 years of college/criminal justice.

11-29

- 1 2 yr. College would be next step
- 2 Eliminate GED
- 3 Yes!

30-99

- 1 Additional minimum of college credits should be included.
 - 2 Associates degree minimum standard.
 - 3 Should be a minimum of 30 college credits.
 - 4 Should require 2 year degree
 - 5 We should have a higher standard in Michigan.
-

Comments on High School Diploma or GED Required Relevant/Appropriate = No

College/University

1-10

- 1 Currently require college credit to attend academy.
 - 2 Should at least have an associates degree
-

30-99

- 1 2-year degree/equivalent credits
 - 2 At least two years of college.
-

Municipal

1-10

- 1 2 years associate degree
 - 2 Associate degree minimum
 - 3 At least assoc degree.
 - 4 Minimum of 2 year degree.
 - 5 Require 2-yr college degree.
 - 6 Should be 2 years college.
 - 7 Should be minimum of 2 yrs. college with assoc. degree
 - 8 With home school more popular I think a college degree as another choice would be appropriate. My son did not go to high school but did go to college.
-

11-29

- 1 2 years college minimum
 - 2 2 years college/university
 - 3 2 yr college
 - 4 2-4 year degree
 - 5 Assoc. degree
 - 6 Associate degree. Should have minimum of 2 yrs. college.
 - 7 At least 2 yr.
 - 8 Minimum of AA degree
 - 9 Should be 2-yr college degree, maybe 4
 - 10 Should be minimum of assoc degree.
 - 11 Should have 30 hrs. college credits.
-

30-99

- 1 2 years of college
- 2 Associate degree minimum.
- 3 At least 2 years college. Prefer BS or BA

	4	Increased to associate or bachelor degree.
<hr/>		
100-200		
	1	2 yrs college.
<hr/>		
<i>Sheriff</i>		
<hr/>		
11-29		
	1	2 year degree.
	2	College
<hr/>		
30-99		
	1	Associate degree or 60 credit hours at four-year institution.
	2	Minimum associates degree.
<hr/>		
100-200		
	1	GED not adequate.
<hr/>		
201+		
	1	2 yr degree
<hr/>		
<i>State</i>		
<hr/>		
11-29		
	1	I feel we should "raise the bar" for entry level and require some college background.
	2	Minimum 2 years of college
	3	Two years of college required
<hr/>		
201+		
	1	At least a two year associates degree.
<hr/>		
<i>Township</i>		
<hr/>		
1-10		
	1	Minimum associate degree.
	2	Should be 2 yrs. College.
	3	Some college should be required, at least 2 year degree.
<hr/>		
11-29		
	1	Assoc. Degree minimum
<hr/>		
30-99		
	1	A college education (at least 2 years) should be a minimum if we wish to professionalize.
<hr/>		

Agency Survey Results for Standard: No Prior Felony Convictions

Is the Standard No Prior Felony Convictions Relevant/Appropriate ?

		Agency Size					
	Agency Type	1-10	11-29	30-99	100-200	201+	Total
Yes	College/University	3	6	3			12
	Municipal	89	56	26	10	2	183
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	24	16	10			50
Total		123	113	54	17	13	320
No	College/University	1					1
	Municipal	1	1	1			3
	Total		2	1	1		

Comments on No Prior Felony Convictions Relevant/Appropriate = Yes

College/University

11-29

1 Integrity evaluation.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Absolutely relevant!
- 2 Do not want felon with gun.
- 3 Minimum no felonies - should include list of misdemeanors
- 4 Must
- 5 This might depend. A bad check felony at age 18 might be a one-time offense that will never happen again.

11-29

- 1 None of any kind
- 2 Qualifying felonies - not all (I.e. a person who modified a license plate 10 years ago).
- 3 Should be arrests.

30-99

- 1 Expungements should be included
- 2 Mandatory elimination

100-200

- 1 No exceptions.

State

11-29

- 1 Absolutely!
 - 2 Very important.
-

201+

- 1 Absolute
-

Township

1-10

- 1 A must!
 - 2 A must.
-

11-29

- 1 Required.
-

30-99

- 1 Absolute
-

Comments on No Prior Felony Convictions Relevant/Appropriate = No

College/University

1-10

- 1 A comprehensive background investigation is more important than just this flat standard.
-

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Include misdemeanor convictions. Include felony arrests.
-

11-29

- 1 And high misdemeanors.
-

30-99

- 1 Certain juvenile offenses should be excluded - non police background use 5-7 year span.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess Good Moral Character

Is the Standard Possess Good Moral Character Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>				
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+ Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3		13
	Municipal	89	56	27	10	1 183
	Other	3	3	1		7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1 45
	State	1	8	4		10 23
	Township	24	16	10		50
Total		124	113	55	17	12 321
No	Municipal	1	1			1 3
	Total	1	1			1 3

Comments on Possess Good Moral Character Relevant/Appropriate = Yes

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Absolutely relevant!
- 2 Have to be held to high standard.
- 3 Must
- 4 Traffic/civil infractions shouldn't weight a lot.

11-29

- 1 How do you prove it?
- 2 Of course

100-200

- 1 No exceptions

Sheriff

1-10

- 1 serves as a role model for children.

100-200

- 1 Difficult to judge.

State

11-29

- 1 Now, more than ever.

Township

1-10

1	A must.	
<hr/>		
11-29		
1	Yes	
<hr/>		
30-99		
1	Absolute	
2	You should combine this with arrests & convictions	
<hr/>		
<i>Comments on Possess Good Moral Character Relevant/Appropriate =</i>		<i>No</i>
<hr/>		
<i>Municipal</i>		
<hr/>		
11-29		
1	What's that - hard to define.	
<hr/>		
201+		
1	Whos (sic) morals	
<hr/>		

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess Valid Michigan Driver License

Is the Standard Possess Valid Michigan Driver License Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
	<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	3	5	3			11
	Municipal	90	55	27	10	2	184
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	24	16	10			50
	Total	124	111	55	17	13	320
No	College/University	1	1				2
	Municipal		2				2
	Total	1	3				4

Comments on Possess Valid Michigan Driver License Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

College/University

11-29

- 1 With less than 3 points, no reckless or careless convictions.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Must
- 2 No alcohol related offenses on record.
- 3 Of Course!

11-29

- 1 Also check out of state.
- 2 Or be able to have one prior to completion of training (out-of-state applicants should be given this opportunity.)

30-99

- 1 At time of employment.
- 2 No misdemeanor charges.
- 3 Place point limit for eligibility.

Sheriff

1-10

- 1 Need to operate MV.

State

11-29

- 1 Should be a MI resident. Good driving record.
-

201+

- 1 Without a doubt
-

Township

1-10

- 1 A must.
2 or obtain before being hired
-

11-29

- 1 Yes
-

30-99

- 1 Should add a limit for the number of chargeable accidents an applicant can have (3)
-

Comments on Possess Valid Michigan Driver License Relevant/Appropriate = No

College/University

1-10

- 1 Need to have a valid license, must obtain Michigan prior to employment.
-

11-29

- 1 Allow individuals from bordering states to be employed/attend Michigan
academies. Must possess a valid driver's license.
-

Municipal

11-29

- 1 No requirement to live in Mich. To be a p.o. so why require one to get hired?
2 Valid operator or chauffeur license from state of residency.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Free from Physical Defects, Chronic Diseases

Is the Standard Free from Physical Defects, Chronic Diseases Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	3	6	3			12
	Municipal	86	56	26	9	2	179
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	23	9	7	1	43
	State	1	8	4		9	22
	Township	21	15	10			46
Total		117	111	53	16	12	309
No	College/University	1					1
	Municipal	4	1	1	1		7
	Sheriff		1	1			2
	State					1	1
	Township	3	1				4
Total		8	3	2	1	1	15

Comments on Free from Physical Defects, Chronic Diseases Relevant/Appropriate =

Yes

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Case by case review.
- 2 It depends on what is wrong.
- 3 Let's be reasonable.
- 4 Must
- 5 Only if it affects job.

11-29

- 1 ADA? Must be able to perform qualifying list of required functions.

30-99

- 1 Within legal guidelines

100-200

- 1 Annual physical fitness test for all officers.

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Make pre-academy physical good for 1 year.
- 2 Ref chronic disease - as long as it doesn't interfere with his/her job.
- 3 Who establishes this standard?
- 4 Within reason.

30-99

- 1 There may be exceptions.
-

State

11-29

- 1 Possible exceptions related to physical defects.
-

201+

- 1 In order to save others
-

Township

11-29

- 1 Yes
-

Comments on Free from Physical Defects, Chronic Diseases Relevant/Appropriate = No
College/University

1-10

- 1 Should focus more on an individual's ability to do the job.
-

Municipal

1-10

- 1 After certification - acquired renal disease or diabetes - where do officers stand?
2 Allowances need to be in place for exceptions.
3 Must prove impairment to job.
4 Some can perform job even with slight disability.
-

11-29

- 1 Depends on what. Needs to be flexible.
-

30-99

- 1 Have to be very careful of what this means. Free from skin cancer???
-

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Free from physical defects that would interfere with their work performance.
-

30-99

- 1 I know several officers that have diabetes, They are able to keep the disease under control and it has never affected their performance.
-

State

201+

- 1 Needs to be better defined.
-

Township

1-10

- 1 A person with some physical defects could still function in police work.
2 If functional, then they work.
-

11-29

- 1 Department's choice.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess Hearing Within Listed Ranges

Is the Standard Possess Hearing Within Listed Ranges Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	90	56	26	10	2	184
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	23	10	7	1	44
	State	1	8	4		9	22
	Township	23	15	10			48
Total		124	111	54	17	12	318
No	Municipal		1	1			2
	Sheriff		1				1
	State					1	1
	Township	1	1				2
Total		1	3	1		1	6

Comments on Possess Hearing Within Listed Ranges Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

College/University

11-29

- 1 Doesn't ask follow up question.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Must
- 2 Only if not justifiable

11-29

- 1 Extend period of time that a hearing test is valid for certification (6 months).
- 2 With correction allowed (i.e. hearing aid).

30-99

- 1 Again within legal parameters

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Make pre-academy hearing test good for 1 year.
- 2 Should be easier to be tested and MCOLES should respect standards set by doctors or Pas.

30-99

- 1 There may be exceptions.

State

1-10

1 What range? [Provided with survey.]

Township

1-10

1 The current standards with an audiologist in some areas is requiring 70 miles drive one way.

11-29

1 Yes

Comments on Possess Hearing Within Listed Ranges Relevant/Appropriate = **No**

Municipal

11-29

1 When I was certified one doctor told me I couldn't hear and a second doctor told me my hearing was fine.

30-99

1 A lot of very experienced officers can not meet this standard.

Sheriff

11-29

1 I don't see the importance of being able to hear a real high pitch. Normal hearing.

State

201+

1 The standards are too strict for the 3000 and 4000 frequency levels.

Township

1-10

1 A little restrictive.

11-29

1 Department's choice.

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess Height and Weightin Relation (Body Mass Index)

Is the Standard Possess Height and Weightin Relation (Body Mass Index) Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	5	3			12
	Municipal	83	54	26	9	2	174
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	20	9	7	1	40
	State	1	8	4		8	21
	Township	20	14	9			43
Total		114	104	52	16	11	297
No	College/University		1				1
	Municipal	7	3	1	1		12
	Sheriff		4	1			5
	State					2	2
	Township	4	2	1			7
Total		11	10	3	1	2	27

Comments on Possess Height and Weightin Relation (BMI) Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Generally appropriate, but the scale may not fit every person.
- 2 Range may be too narrow - I.e. BMI +/- 10% as example.

11-29

- 1 ADA? Must be able to perform qualifying list of required functions.
- 2 Weight should be an important factor.

30-99

- 1 Mostly yes, however one of my officers is a weight lifter that also runs distance, 5'11", 240 lbs.

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 MCOLES should consider some variance in this standard and should take some factors into consideration
- 2 Throughout career.
- 3 Would like to see standards for officers throughout career.

201+

- 1 I'm not comfortable with doing away with current agility test and the new proposed academy standard.

State

201+

- 1 Continue with mandated physical fitness testing throughout career.
 - 2 Lose the right to be unfit!
-

Township

1-10

- 1 Should be state required physical fitness.
 - 2 Within reason.
-

11-29

- 1 Maybe, within a given range.
 - 2 This is not enforced in academy standards well at all.
-

Comments on Possess Height and Weightin Relation (BMI) Relevant/Appropriate = No

College/University

11-29

- 1 Some officers need a 5'2" height requirement minimum standard.
-

Municipal

1-10

- 1 I know a lot of heavy officers that do a great job.
 - 2 Must prove impairment to job.
 - 3 Too subjective
 - 4 You get into a discrimination problem here.
-

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 It has been my experience that these scales are very poor measures when it comes to body building or anyone who is well built.
 - 2 To be left up to the agency.
 - 3 We have a 6-7 and a 2 over 300 lbs. and a 115 lbs. officers all good ones.
-

State

201+

- 1 Can they pass required physical tests?
-

Township

1-10

- 1 More in line with officers ability to perform functions.
 - 2 Performance and ability, not numbers on a chart.
 - 3 Should not have a bearing on capabilities.
 - 4 Skinny or fat, I know good cops in both areas.
-

11-29

- 1 Department's choice.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities

Is the Standard Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
	<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	90	57	27	10	2	186
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	9	6	1	43
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	23	16	9			48
	Total	124	114	53	16	13	320
No	Sheriff			1	1		2
	Township	1		1			2
	Total	1		2	1		4

Comments on Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

College/University

11-29

- 1 (except Chiefs)

Municipal

1-10

- 1 A must!!
- 2 Must
- 3 Needs to be cost effective for smaller departments.
- 4 Should be tested prior to enrollment into college or academies.
- 5 Vital. I do not want people who hear voices, etc.

11-29

- 1 Hard to measure.
- 2 How do you prove it?
- 3 Require psych exam.
- 4 The ability to check such records to verify is critically important.

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 More time needs to be spent here.

30-99

- 1 Should be mandatory evaluation by psychologist or psychiatrist

Township

1-10

1 No prior history

30-99

1 Absolute

Comments on Free from Mental and Emotional Instabilities Relevant/Appropriate = No

Sheriff

30-99

1 Physicians will not sign off the MCOLES checklist. We cannot test this until a candidate is hired as fulltime.

100-200

1 Each department is doing a complete background investigation and oral boards before candidate is hired.

Township

1-10

1 Who is?

30-99

1 Without a more specific description of what this is, this should be left to the employing agency.

***Agency Survey Results for Standard:
Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound and in Possession of
Extremities***

Is the Standard Free from Impediment of the Senses and Physically Sound Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Yes</i>	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	89	55	26	10	2	182
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	23	16	10			49
	<i>Total</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>319</i>
<i>No</i>	Municipal	1	2	1			4
	Township	1					1
	<i>Total</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>			<i>5</i>

Comments on Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound Relevant/Appropriate = Yes
Municipal

1-10

- 1 Depends on duties - work related on duty injuries.
- 2 In most cases. There may, however, but some exceptions.
- 3 Only as ADA complies

11-29

- 1 ADA? Must be able to perform qualifying list of required functions.

Comments on Free from Impediment of the Senses, Physically Sound Relevant/Appropriate = No
Municipal

1-10

- 1 Must prove impairment to job.

11-29

- 1 Depends on the degree of impediment.

30-99

- 1 See #7 (Have to be careful what this means.)

Township

1-10

- 1 End of finger - example

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess Normal Color Vision

Is the Standard Possess Normal Color Vision Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
	<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	80	50	27	10	1	168
	Other	2	3	1			6
	Sheriff	3	22	10	6	1	42
	State	1	6	4		9	20
	Township	23	16	10			49
	Total	113	103	55	16	11	298
No	Municipal	10	7			1	18
	Other	1					1
	Sheriff		2		1		3
	State		2			1	3
	Township	1					1
	Total	12	11		1	2	26

Comments on Possess Normal Color Vision Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

Municipal

1-10

- 1 If it impacts the person's ability to do the job.
- 2 What's normal?

11-29

- 1 Extend period of time that vision test is valid for certification (6 months).

100-200

- 1 Some color deficiencies may be acceptable.

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Has been challenged lately? May not be as important as some items.
- 2 Make pre-academy vision test good for 1 year.

State

1-10

- 1 What is normal?

Comments on Possess Normal Color Vision Relevant/Appropriate = **No**

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Can now be corrected
 - 2 I do not believe this should prevent someone from entering police work.
 - 3 Many color-blind people can adjust to this problem. It would rarely have an effect on one's ability to perform most police duties.
 - 4 Minor deficiencies acceptable with medical waiver.
 - 5 This one needs to go. I have known a lot of great cops in years past who were color blind.
 - 6 What is normal, not use current standard, do they know red, green, blue, yellow, not shades of each.
-

11-29

- 1 Again, needs to be flexible.
 - 2 Does color blindness really present a problem?
 - 3 Limited color blindness should be allowed.
 - 4 One of the best police officers I know is color blind.
 - 5 We have a color-blind detective who is excellent.
-

Other

1-10

- 1 Needs to be reviewed.
-

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Believe it should be looked at on case-by-case basis. (Should not automatically disqualify)
 - 2 People learn to adapt.
-

100-200

- 1 Not appropriate - ways to compensate. Eliminates too many good candidates.
-

State

11-29

- 1 Evaluated on a case by case basis.
-

Township

1-10

- 1 Why?
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye

Is the Standard Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	3	5	2			10
	Municipal	86	55	25	10	2	178
	Other	2	3	1			6
	Sheriff	3	23	10	7	1	44
	State	1	8	4		9	22
	Township	23	16	9			48
Total		118	110	51	17	12	308
No	College/University	1	1	1			3
	Municipal	4	2	2			8
	Other	1					1
	Sheriff		1				1
	State					1	1
	Township	1		1			2
Total		7	4	4		1	16

Comments on Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

Municipal

11-29

- 1 Corrected - I don't want to see an uncorrected standard.
- 2 Corrected 20/40 would be acceptable.

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Whatever is the accepted measure nationwide.

State

1-10

- 1 Laser surgery?

11-29

- 1 Must still be able to see without glasses in case they are knocked off during a scuffle.

Township

11-29

- 1 Within a couple of points maybe.

College/University

1-10

- 1 Needs to be documented prior to entering academy and not after graduation.
-

Municipal

1-10

- 1 I wouldn't want to lose a good candidate. 20/20 should be expanded.
 - 2 If greater than 20/20, then demonstrate ability to see with relative testing.
 - 3 Must prove impairment to job.
-

11-29

- 1 I know of two good policemen with only one eye.
-

Other

1-10

- 1 Needs to be reviewed.
-

State

201+

- 1 A person with non-normal color vision can still perform the essential job functions of a police officer.
-

Township

1-10

- 1 Implement a test that would prove one's ability to function with vision impaired - i.e. hand-eye coordination demo.
-

30-99

- 1 Most police have glasses don't meet this requirement.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye

Is the Standard Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye Relevant/Appropriate ?

		Agency Size					
	Agency Type	1-10	11-29	30-99	100-200	201+	Total
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	84	56	27	10	2	179
	Other	2	3	1			6
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	22	16	9			47
	Total	116	113	54	17	13	313
No	Municipal	6	1				7
	Other	1					1
	Township	2		1			3
	Total	9	1	1			11

Comments on Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

College/University

1-10

- 1 Needs to be documented prior to entering academy and not after graduation.

Municipal

11-29

- 1 20/20 corrected
- 2 ADA? Must be able to perform qualifying list of required functions.
- 3 Corrected to.
- 4 Not sure what normal visual function is?

State

11-29

- 1 For officer safety.

Comments on Possess Normal Visual Functions in Each Eye Relevant/Appropriate = **No**

Municipal

1-10

- 1 20/20 correctable is ok.
- 2 Could have some limitations within reason.
- 3 I have personally known 2 officer with only 1 eye. They learn to compensate.
- 4 Must prove impairment to job.

Other

1-10

- 1 Eyeglass use ok.
-

Township

1-10

- 1 Implement a test that would prove one's ability to function with vision impaired - i.e. hand-eye coordination demo.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Pass MCOLES Reading and Writing Examination

Is the Standard Pass MCOLES Reading and Writing Examination Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	90	55	27	10	2	184
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	23	10	7	1	44
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	24	16	9			49
Total		125	111	54	17	13	320
No	Municipal		2				2
	Sheriff		1				1
	Township			1			1
Total			3	1			4

Comments on Pass MCOLES Reading and Writing Examination Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Do not allow tests to be read to individuals.
- 2 Make this at least a grade 12 level.
- 3 Must
- 4 This is absolutely the biggest failure by MCOLES I have noted.

11-29

- 1 MCOLES should be responsible

30-99

- 1 A good starting standard
- 2 Need to reinstate physical agility test
- 3 Should be stricter - too easy
- 4 Unsure how effective these tests are. Our department puts little weight on these scores.

100-200

- 1 Prior to application

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 Sometimes people don't test well, but still make good police officers. Some are also book smart and street stupid. Not sold on test.

201+

- 1 Don't do away with tests. The proposed new standard does not help us or recruits at all.

State

11-29

- 1 Too many MI officers are practically illiterate.

30-99

- 1 Should be taken care of by requiring an associate degree.

Township

1-10

- 1 Extremely important.
2 Need to raise standards.

11-29

- 1 I think the standards for reading and writing should be raised.
2 Or approved agency test - as statute.
3 Statewide standard - eliminate agency equivalent test.

30-99

- 1 Eliminate "C" band.
2 Perhaps use the same MCOLES test for all agencies rather than "agency" tests.
3 This test is far too easy and is the simplest way for MCOLES to improve the applicant pool. Harder Test!

Comments on Pass MCOLES Reading and Writing Examination Relevant/Appropriate = No

Municipal

11-29

- 1 Individual department to test.
2 No need

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 This should have been determined prior to going to academy, etc.
-

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Examination by a Licensed Physician

Is the Standard Examination by a Licensed Physician Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>				
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+ Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3		13
	Municipal	90	54	26	10	2 182
	Other	3	3	1		7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1 45
	State	1	8	4		10 23
	Township	24	16	10		50
Total		125	111	54	17	13 320
No	Municipal		3	1		4
	Total		3	1		4

Comments on Examination by a Licensed Physician Relevant/Appropriate = Yes

Municipal

1-10

- 1 As required by the job - better mental health fitness
- 2 I think the applicant should be responsible for the costs.

11-29

- 1 Extend the time that a physical is valid for certification purposes to 6 mo.

100-200

- 1 Consider allowing exams by PACs

Township

1-10

- 1 Accept academy exam as proof of fitness - no additional exam 8-0 weeks after 1st one to get in academy.

11-29

- 1 Department required.
- 2 Done by department as part of pre-employment check.

30-99

- 1 And clearly require a psychological review for all new applicants/certs.

Comments on Examination by a Licensed Physician Relevant/Appropriate = No

Municipal

11-29

- 1 Have applicant provide past medical records from their doctor.
- 2 No need

3	Should have psychological exam prior to entering training.
<hr/>	
30-99	
1	Also add physician's assistant.
<hr/>	

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records

Is the Standard Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
	<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	90	56	27	10	2	185
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	9	7	1	44
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	24	16	10			50
Total		125	113	54	17	13	322
No	Municipal		1				1
	Sheriff			1			1
	Total		1	1			2

Comments on Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

Municipal

1-10

- 1 Also disclose juvi record.
- 2 Must

30-99

- 1 Not yet timely.

State

201+

- 1 Absolutely

Township

11-29

- 1 Done by department as part of pre-employment check

Comments on Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records Relevant/Appropriate = **No**

Municipal

11-29

- 1 No need

Sheriff

30-99

- 1 Done through MCOLES academy.

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability

Is the Standard Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Agency Type</i>		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	89	56	27	10	2	184
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	24	15	10			49
	Total	124	112	55	17	13	321
No	Municipal	1	1				2
	Township		1				1
	Total	1	2				3

Comments on Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

Municipal

1-10

1 Must

11-29

1 Department hiring responsibility.

2 Oral interviews are not very effective tools so they should be very controlled and limited in value.

30-99

1 VIP personality flaws opened

Township

11-29

1 Done by department as part of pre-employment check

30-99

1 We would conduct our own.

Comments on Conduct an Oral Interview to Determine Suitability Relevant/Appropriate = **No**

Municipal

11-29

1 Individual department to test.

Township

11-29

1 Up to the agency what they do.

Agency Survey Results for Standard: Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances

Is the Standard Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances Relevant/Appropriate ?

		<i>Agency Size</i>					
	<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	90	56	27	10	2	185
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	24	10	7	1	45
	State	1	8	4		10	23
	Township	24	16	10			50
	Total	125	113	55	17	13	323
No	Municipal		1				1
	Total		1				1

Comments on Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances Relevant/Appropriate = **Yes**

College/University

11-29

1 A must.

Municipal

1-10

- 1 A must
- 2 Applicant should be responsible for the cost.
- 3 Applicant should be tested but I see no need for applicant to have to go to MCOLES location to be tested. Local hospital or doctor's office should be ok to keep costs down for small police departments.
- 4 It would be the height of stupidity to not have this requirement.
- 5 Must

11-29

1 Test pre- & post during 1 yr. Probation period.

100-200

1 No exceptions

Sheriff

11-29

- 1 This should also be done before the applicant enters police academy. Why spend the time training then have the person not pass a drug test.
- 2 This should be done all through a career. Absolutely.

State

201+

- 1 What about prior use?
-

Township

1-10

- 1 Once per year!
-

11-29

- 1 Department required.
2 Done by department as part of pre-employment check
-

30-99

- 1 And periodic retests within a range of years.
-

Comments on Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances Relevant/Appropriate = *No*

Municipal

11-29

- 1 Proven these tests are not 100%.
-

Agency Survey: Other Standards and Additional Comments on Existing Standards

- 1 Have all of an employee's past employers submit comments for the employees certification record if the officer moves from job to job.

- 2 I think all standards are appropriate.

- 3 Read/write/speak the english language to a (sic) acceptable level.

- 4 Testing for AIDS, Hepatitis B

- 5 Re question 7 - Have had problems with MCOLES in the past on candidates with marginal, yet controlled, diabetes - this should be up to the agency, not MCOLES.

- 6 Criminal and psychological exam should be given prior to police academy or college courses to become police officer to avoid waste of resources on someone we know will never be hired as an officer.

- 7 Officer fitness - conduct classes on fitness, running, jogging, weight lifting - how to do properly- without getting hurt. A great need to eat properly. How to deal with stress, how to eat, diet for shift change - midnights, etc. Need more on how officers should learn to care of themselves.

- 8 Why do all the physical exams again if hired right out of academy? Eye exam, psychologist, etc. also.

- 9 At least 21 years of age. Credit Check. Driving Record. Background Investigation (employers, neighbors, etc.)

- 10 None, you do a very good job.

- 11 Basic training programs under MCOLES auspices (within area colleges) are accepting virtually anyone into the programs - lax or non-existent screening. Many academy graduates are (or should be) unhireable. The biggest crisis in law enforcement at the present time is the quality of the average p.o. candidate fresh from an "academy."

- 12 I believe that anything within the above 19 items listed for pre-employment/employment standards are very adequate.

- 13 Personality Traits/Ethics (history)

- 14 Re question 20: This is a nebulous area. Given how many times psychologists can disagree and how many times people can manage to pass tests, I don't know that there can ever be any "guarantees" here.

- 15 Mandate psychological testing.

- 16 Screen and test for dyslexia.

- 17 A complete background check.

- 18 Some sort of fitness review after a certain number of years in job.

- 19
 1. 1-yr. Requirement for candidate to find LE position - extend to 2 yrs.
 2. Database that will allow LE agencies to enter to research those holding certification.

- 20 I think MCOLES has done a good job with the requirements.

- 21 Re question 6: I hire seasonal police officers. I don't have enough time to make the hire and get a psych. I rely on the physician to check this. On full-time hires I do take the candidate to a licensed psychologist.

- 22 Set strict driving record standard.
-
- 23 Complete background investigation - standardized for all applicants.
-
- 24 Physical fitness testing should be included at the end of each academy not just as part of pretesting.
-
- 25 I believe, as in #20 above, that no police dept should hire without a face-to-face interview and a psychological exam by a licensed psychologist. This would be a minimum and well worth the time and expense.
-
- 26 I am a un-uniformed officer in (--) township - but I am also employed by the (--) Co. Sheriff's Department - any training, etc, is done through that department.
-
- 27 More background on out of state transfers.
-
- 28 Intensive background check.
-
- 29 Constable position - elected, not screened.
-
- 30 Candidates should not be allowed to continually try to pass physical agility tests. If they fail after the 2nd attempt, they should not be allowed to go further.
-
- 31 Offer some type of advanced certificate or senior patrol officer based on higher level of training/education.
-
- 32 Have applicant tested for, and accepted by MCOLES, prior to becoming certifiable, hearing, vision and psychological. Completion of certification documents via internet.
-
- 33 The cost of hiring new candidates for certification is burdensome for small departments, where many new officers start and don't stay long. It would be helpful if there were funds available for the physical and drug testing or let the candidate be responsible for the cost.
-
- 34 Continuing/In-service physical agility standard - Mandatory.
-
- 35 State-wide background verifiable standards. Fitness standards. Regional training centers.
-
- 36 Consistent standard for #10 (mental and emotional stability).
-
- 37 I have seen too many officers who have no business being police officers. If the standards were a little higher, such as college degree, it would help weed them out. Obviously this should be done at the dept. level but it's not. If they breathe they got hired. I would also like to see a minimum number of hours worked per year to maintain certification.
-
- 38 Random drug testing throughout your career. Critical Incident Training. Dynamics of Domestic Violence.
-
- 39 I believe MCOLES must work with employing agencies to certify officers rather than taking the bureaucratic approach it currently has. Jurisdictions have different needs and standards. Physical fitness, vision, hearing and physical integrity should be determined by the department.
-
- 40 Physically fit.
-
- 41 Provide minimum standards to be met by background investigation.
-
- 42 Many candidates cannot write simple reports. We have to send them to report writing school. They do not possess reading and writing skills that are close to that of our city's residents.
-
- 43 Immunity for past employers to be honest for backgrounds.
-

- 44 Physical agility testing. Cultural awareness testing.
-
- 45 Just a note: being from a small community, I have had local people that would have made good local officers that could not pass the physical tests and so were washed out of the program. The state should let local communities hire their own people for their own needs.
-
- 46 I don't feel making everyone complete a psychological test will accomplish anything. In my 26 years of experience, I have seen candidates fail the psychological for one department and go to another department only to become a great officer with a long career.
-
- 47 This covers a broad area on making these people meet and complete standards to qualify to become a law enforcement officer in the state of Michigan.
-
- 48 Thorough background check.
-
- 49 Medical insurance should be paid to any officer who has attained age 55 and has 25 years of service - statewide. It is embarrassing watching 65 year old men try to continue working because they can't afford to pay medical insurance. Most northern departments/cities flat out refuse to take care of older officers.
-
- 50 Maybe there should be a time frame that when a candidate graduates the academy that their entry results are still valid. As to not duplicate the process for certification once the candidate graduates the academy.
-
- 51 Thorough background investigations.
-
- 52 Yes! Pretesting for spelling, grammar and ability to construct. You can't create a "professional" without standards. If an officer with an MBA writes a report at a 6th grade level, then other professionals reading the report will always view this officer as a "goober," not a professional. You not only need to set minimum standards of education, but you need to test and record.
-
- 53 Bring back physical abilities examination; skills: wall climb, dummy drag. These are imperative upper body strength assessments proving one's ability to perform the job in the field. You can do the job or you can't - simple! After all - a fellow officer's life will depend on it.
-
- 54 No misdemeanor convictions
-
- 55 No, but I sure would like to see MCOLES take the next big step and do some background checks. It just seems so counter productive to perform all the testing and send a candidate through basic training only to later learn that they may not be certifiable.
-
- 56 Qualification inquiry to history of domestic violence meeting requirements of federal-state laws.
-
- 57 Continued abilities to pass a minimum standards physical agility/strength/endurance test.
-
- 58 No.
-
- 59 Driving record.
-
- 60 Character, some misdemeanors, driving record, previous convictions, accidents.
-
- 61 Require all police applications and background investigations to be entered into a common computer database - eases process of identifying "job hoppers."
-
- 62 DNA testing; psychological testing.
-
- 63 Driving record.
-

- 64 Push for standards that will demand higher pay for officers. The village of (--) secretary is paid more than the village police officers. Dept. of public works earn certificates, such as water b or c or d and are paid for each higher level of training. I don't think police officers can be trained enough.
-
- 65 Polygraph
-
- 66 There seems to be those that are spending a lot of money for certifiability that most likely will not be hired. Some kind of hireability standard.
-
- 67 Require regional academies to have all candidates evaluated for emotional instability and fitness for duty by a psychologist or psychiatrist prior to enrollment.
-
- 68 Basic computer skills.
-
- 69 Previous law enforcement experience - reasons for leaving and returning, reasons for leaving agencies - we need to reduce the amount of "marginal" officers that seek employment with other agencies. The problem of "sanitized" personnel files is a problem.
-
- 70 Reciprocal certification. Officers receiving training certification in another state - completing MI written test - avoiding Mich. training.
-
- 71 Re question 20: You can not test a seasoned officers and expect them to show the same results as a new candidate.
-
- 72 2 years of college.
-
- 73 We have enough standards if they are used correctly. What bothers me is that once you are selected you do not need to meet the standards to keep your job, except the felony conviction standard. Example physical standards are not required. An officer can lie on a report or to a supervisor and the agency can take administrative action but it is not enforced by MCOLES as a standard violation.
-
- 74 Re question 20: Tests that our licensed psychologist administers include MMPI, California Personal Inventory, OTIS Quick Score Mental Ability Test, Cattell Test, Watson/Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal. In addition to this, the (--) Police Department does an intensive background on applicants. We also require an applicant have an Associate degree or 60 college credits, absent 2 years prior sworn experience or 2 year active military.
-
- 75 If officers are seeking employment with another agency, I would strongly suggest mandatory disclosure by the employing department to the potential new employer. Discipline problems or suspensions must be disclosed even though they are no longer retained in officer's file, due to union contract requirements. This would curtail officers who are marginal to be passed off on another unsuspecting agency.
-
- 76 Have drug screening available in all major cities (Kalamazoo).
-

Agency Survey Results: Methods Required to Screen Candidates for Mental/Emotional Instabilities

College/University

<i>1-10</i>	3	2	2	0	0	0
<i>11-29</i>	2	5	3	0	0	0
<i>30-99</i>	1	2	1	0	0	2
<i>Total:</i>	6	9	6	0	0	2

Municipal

<i>1-10</i>	46	31	55	1	0	4
<i>11-29</i>	17	46	26	0	0	9
<i>30-99</i>	6	26	12	1	0	8
<i>100-200</i>	2	9	6	0	0	3
<i>201+</i>	2	2	2	0	0	1
<i>Total:</i>	73	114	101	2	0	25

Other

<i>1-10</i>	1	2	1	0	0	0
<i>11-29</i>	1	3	1	0	0	1
<i>30-99</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Total:</i>	2	6	2	0	0	1

Sheriff

<i>1-10</i>	3	1	3	1	1	1
<i>11-29</i>	14	5	15	1	0	1
<i>30-99</i>	4	4	4	0	0	2
<i>100-200</i>	3	4	5	0	0	1
<i>201+</i>	0	1	1	0	0	0
<i>Total:</i>	24	15	28	2	1	5

State

<i>1-10</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0
-------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

<i>11-29</i>	4	3	7	0	0	3
<i>30-99</i>	0	3	2	0	0	0
<i>201+</i>	0	6	3	0	0	6
<i>Total:</i>	4	13	12	0	0	9

Township						
<i>1-10</i>	13	5	15	0	0	2
<i>11-29</i>	7	13	12	1	0	2
<i>30-99</i>	5	9	8	0	0	4
<i>Total:</i>	25	27	35	1	0	8

<i>Grand Totals:</i>	134	184	184	5	1	50
-----------------------------	------------	------------	------------	----------	----------	-----------

Standardized Tests Reported:

IMPA
 MMPI
 MMPI
 Personal Assessment Inventory, Cal Psychological Inventory
 MMPI
 MMPI
 "16 Personality Factors" Form A
 Inwald 2 and 8; Hilson
 Personal History Questionnaire
 Drugs
 MMPPT
 University Opinion Questionnaire - Taylor/Johnson
 IPI, PAI

***POST Survey Results for the Standard:
Minimum Age 18***

<i>Yes</i>	Arizona	21 years in Arizona
	District of Columbia	At least 20 years and 6 months.
	Florida	19 years of age. Refer to Chapter 943.13, F.S.
	Michigan	
	Missouri	Will soon be 20 years of age.
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	Ohio	21 years of age in civil service controlled locales.
	Vermont	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	However, no agency hires at this age - usually 21 plus.

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

13

<i>No</i>	Alaska	21 minimum.
	Arkansas	21 years of age.
	California	20-1/2 years of age at the time of hire, 21 by the time academy training is completed.
	Idaho	We don't set a minimum age, but require 2 years of responsible work following high school - military is counted. This would generally mean most applicants would have to be at least 20 years old.
	Indiana	21 years of age, unless employed by a department or agency that employs officers at a lesser age; they must have a town ordinance to do so.
	Kansas	2 years of age.
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	Our minimum is 21 years. We believe it helps to ensure a level of maturity.
	Minnesota	
	Nebraska	NE is 21, and that is often too young.
	North Carolina	Minimum age of 20, allows graduates of 2 year associate to enter BLET courses.
	North Dakota	
	Oklahoma	Must attain 21 years of age prior to certification as a peace officer.
	Oregon	21 years.
	Texas	21
	Utah	21 years or older, no maximum.
	Washington	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

17

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess U.S. Citizenship

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	Or intent to become a US citizen.
	Arizona	By statute.
	Arkansas	
	California	
	District of Columbia	
	Florida	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	
	Kansas	
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	Individuals sworn to uphold the laws of the USA should be citizens.
	Michigan	Prior to completion of basic training.
	Minnesota	
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	For law enforcement officers. Recent change in legislation for dispatchers does not require US citizenship.
	New York	
	North Carolina	
	Oklahoma	Or resident alien status.
	Oregon	
	Utah	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	Chiefs of Police and state LE officers are not required to be citizens of the United States.
	Wyoming	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>		<i>25</i>
<i>No</i>	North Dakota	Yes for appointed officers, no for hired.
	Ohio	
	Texas	Currently considering this rule.
	Vermont	
	Washington	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>		<i>5</i>

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess High School Diploma/GED

Yes

Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	
District of Columbia	Effective Dec. 31, 2003, must have an equivalent of 2 years post-secondary education from an accredited college.
Florida	
Idaho	
Indiana	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Maryland	With the complexities of the law and to pass an academy, this is necessary.
Michigan	Only if agency-sponsored. Individuals sponsoring themselves through training must have a minimum of an associate degree upon completion of the academy.
Minnesota	
Missouri	
Nebraska	
New Hampshire	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	No correspondence high school diplomas.
North Dakota	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Texas	

	Utah	
	Vermont	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	See comments. See www.wilenet.org - included will be the 60-college credit employment requirement for full-time and part-time officers.
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
		<i>29</i>
<i>No</i>	Washington	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
		<i>1</i>

POST Survey Results for the Standard: No Prior Felony Convictions

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	
	Arkansas	
	California	
	District of Columbia	Engaged in conduct that would constitute a felony under D.C. law whether or not an arrest is made.
	Florida	Refer to Chapter 943.13, F.S.
	Idaho	
	Indiana	
	Kansas	And no expunged convictions or diversions - also same for domestic violence.
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	This is critical.
	Michigan	Includes expunged felonies.
	Minnesota	
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	Can receive a pardon then be eligible.
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Only exception is an "unconditional pardon" from the Governor.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Includes expunged convictions.
	Oklahoma	Or crime involving moral turpitude.
	Oregon	
	Texas	Includes Class A misdemeanors.
	Utah	
	Vermont	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>		<i>29</i>
<i>No</i>	Washington	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	<i>1</i>

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess Good Moral Character

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	
	Arkansas	
	California	
	District of Columbia	
	Florida	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	
	Kansas	
	Maryland	This is critical.
	Michigan	
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Difficult to define; complaints of too general in nature or arbitrary.
	North Dakota	
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	Texas	
	Utah	
	Vermont	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

25

<i>No</i>	Kentucky	
	Minnesota	
	Ohio	Local issue determined by hiring agency.
	Virginia	
	Washington	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

5

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess Valid In-State Driver License

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	
	Arkansas	Arkansas license.
	California	
	District of Columbia	Valid from state of residence.
	Indiana	
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	You should also require a driving record check to ensure that the applicant is a safe, responsible driver.
	Michigan	At the time of certification. A valid license from any state is required for attendance at a training academy.
	Nebraska	A valid operator's license at time of admission. Not state specific.
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	Ohio	
	Oklahoma	
	Utah	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

19

<i>No</i>	Florida	
	Idaho	Only require valid DL. We have officers who work for bordering LE agencies but live in Washington or Oregon and have that state DL. Idaho code requires Idaho DL if an Idaho resident.
	Kansas	Most of the time this is an agency requirement.
	Minnesota	
	Missouri	
	North Carolina	
	North Dakota	
	Oregon	
	Texas	
	Vermont	Required by individual department, not by Academy.
	Washington	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

11

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Free from Physical Defects/Chronic Diseases

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	California	
	District of Columbia	No uncontrolled seizures, diabetes, hepatitis, active respiratory or infectious diseases of the lungs, hypertension if systolic is 140 mm Hg or greater.
	Idaho	
	Indiana	
	Kansas	"Which might adversely affect the applicant's performance as a police officer."
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	"Must be physically fit to perform law enforcement duties."
	Michigan	That would impact the individual's ability to perform the essential job functions. Reviewed individually by a physician.
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Require that a physical exam be conducted and has established medical screening guidelines which are recommended - not mandated.
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	Texas	Per Administrative Rule 217.1 (a) (11)
	Utah	
	Vermont	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
	<i>22</i>	
<i>No</i>	Arkansas	Physical is required; hiring agency evaluates results.
	Florida	Must pass physical exam.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Virginia	Code says they must have a physical, not pass a physical.
	Washington	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
	<i>8</i>	

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess Hearing within Listed Ranges

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	California	POST's medical screening manual can be found on our website at post.ca.gov.
	District of Columbia	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Hearing necessary to complete all basic training.
	Kansas	"Which might adversely affect the applicant's performance as a police officer."
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	"Must be physically fit to perform law enforcement duties."
	Michigan	Hearing aids are allowed to meet specified criteria.
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	Oregon	
	Utah	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

15

<i>No</i>	Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	Normal hearing without pathology of irreversible disease. Hearing aids allowed.
	North Carolina	Recommended standard, not mandated.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Texas	
	Vermont	
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

15

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Height and Weight in Relation (Body Mass Index)

<i>Yes</i>	California	
	District of Columbia	
	Maryland	"Must be physically fit to perform law enforcement duties."
	Michigan	If a candidate fails this measure by Body Mass Index, he/she must pass a cardiovascular stress test.
	New Mexico	
	Vermont	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
		<i>6</i>
<i>No</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Idaho	Too many problems with this in the past - now we require they pass a fitness test which takes care of this requirement.
	Indiana	Must be able to pass all physical fitness exams in order to successfully complete academy.
	Kansas	
	Kentucky	Physical agility standard in place; no ratios exist per se.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	Difficult to justify as job related.
	New York	
	North Carolina	
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	Texas	
	Utah	
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
		<i>24</i>

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Free from Mental and Emotional Instability

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	Arkansas	Psychological required.
	California	
	District of Columbia	Pass a psychological exam.
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Determined by physician.
	Kansas	
	Kentucky	Local control is overriding spirit of KY law; suitability screener report made available to agencies.
	Maryland	Must be emotionally fit to perform law enforcement duties.
	Michigan	Currently allowed to be assessed by a physician or a licensed psychologist.
	Minnesota	
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Psychological screening exam must be conducted by a NC licensed psychiatrist/psychologist; results made available to agency head to make hiring decision.
	North Dakota	
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	
	Texas	Per Administrative Rule 217.1 (a) (12)
	Utah	Done at department level prior to entry into POST.
	Vermont	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>		<i>26</i>
<i>No</i>	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Virginia	
	Washington	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>		<i>4</i>

***POST Survey Results for the Standard:
Free from Impediment of Senses, Physically Sound, and in
Possession of Extremities***

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	California	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Applicant shall possess strength, agility, vision, and hearing necessary to complete all requirements of the basic training program.
	Kansas	"Which might adversely affect the applicant's performance as a police officer."
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	"Must be physically fit to perform law enforcement duties."
	Michigan	That would impact the individual's ability to perform the essential job functions. Reviewed individually by a physician.
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Physical exam required but no pass/fail standard; decision left up to hiring authority.
	Oregon	
	Texas	Per Administrative Rule 217.1 (a) (11)
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
	<i>17</i>	
<i>No</i>	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
	District of Columbia	
	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Must demonstrate ability to perform essential student performance objectives.
	Oklahoma	
	Utah	
	Vermont	Must pass Physical Training Test for full-time and pass psychological exam.
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
	<i>13</i>	

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess Normal Color Vision

<i>Yes</i>	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	Arkansas	
	California	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Applicant shall possess strength, agility, vision, and hearing necessary to complete all requirements of the basic training program.
	Kansas	"Which might adversely affect the applicant's performance as a police officer."
	Kentucky	Case by case recommended; normal vision is goal but variations acceptable.
	Maryland	"Must be physically fit to perform law enforcement duties."
	Michigan	Candidates failing an Ishihara test must pass the Farnsworth D-15.
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	Oregon	If not normal, must pass Ishihara test and Farnsworth-Munsell 100-hue test.
	Utah	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
	<i>15</i>	
<i>No</i>	Alaska	
	District of Columbia	Color blindness may be a disqualifier.
	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	North Carolina	Recommended in Medical Screening Guidelines Manual.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Texas	
	Vermont	Part of Driver's Exam.
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
	<i>15</i>	

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess 20/20 Corrected Vision in Each Eye

<i>Yes</i>	California	
	District of Columbia	20/100 vision, correctable to 20/30 in both eyes.
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Applicant shall possess strength, agility, vision, and hearing necessary to complete all requirements of the basic training program.
	Kansas	"Which might adversely affect the applicant's performance as a police officer."
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	"Must be physically fit to perform law enforcement duties."
	Michigan	Both eyes correctable to 20/20; no minimum uncorrected standard.
	New Mexico	20/30 - Same as Driver License requirements.
	Utah	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
	<i>10</i>	
<i>No</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	All in relation to accommodation as per ADA.
	Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	20/30 minimum without pathology.
	New Hampshire	20/30 weaker eye distance, 20/40 near vision binocular, at least 20/200 uncorrected binocular.
	New York	20/100 uncorrected; correctable to 20/30.
	North Carolina	Recommended in Medical Screening Guidelines Manual.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Oregon	20/30 corrected each eye.
	Texas	
	Vermont	Required by some departments.
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
	<i>20</i>	

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Possess Normal Visual Function in Each Eye

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	California	
	District of Columbia	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Applicant shall possess strength, agility, vision, and hearing necessary to complete all requirements of the basic training program.
	Kansas	"Which might adversely affect the applicant's performance as a police officer."
	Michigan	
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	Oregon	
	Utah	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
		<i>13</i>

<i>No</i>	Arizona	
	Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
	Florida	Determined by employing agency.
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment.
	Missouri	
	North Carolina	Recommended in Medical Screening Guidelines Manual.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Texas	
	Vermont	Required as part of Driver's Exam.
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
		<i>17</i>

***POST Survey Results for the Standard:
Pass Reading/Writing Exam or Agency Equivalent Test***

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	California	California POST has a reading and writing exam.
	District of Columbia	Written test.
	Florida	Required to pass a Commission-approved Basic Abilities Test.
	Indiana	Prior to acceptance for training.
	Michigan	A multiple-choice test is used which assesses vocabulary, grammar, and composition.
	Missouri	
	Nebraska	We use the Magraw Hill TABE test. Must pass reading and comprehension of English at the 11th grade level.
	New Mexico	Part of psychological testing.
	New York	
	Oregon	effective 9/1/02 at 12th grade reading/writing level.
	Utah	Reading, writing, math, grammar at 70% in each category.
	Vermont	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
		<i>13</i>

<i>No</i>	Arizona	
	Arkansas	No such examination required at the state level.
	Idaho	Only require this for our self-sponsored students.
	Kansas	
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	However, they must pass academy exams with a minimal score.
	Minnesota	Hiring agency must determine applicant's suitability to perform duties of employment, though the licensing exam itself has somewhat the same function.
	New Hampshire	
	North Carolina	NC is researching BLET entrance standard to include minimum reading level.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Texas	
	Virginia	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
	<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
		<i>17</i>

***POST Survey Results for the Standard:
Pass Physical Fitness Exam or Agency Equivalent Test***

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	
	California	
	District of Columbia	
	Florida	Refer to Chapter 943.13, F.S.
	Idaho	
	Indiana	Prior to acceptance for training.
	Kentucky	
	Michigan	A six-event physical skills test is currently used as a pre-employment standard. A four-event pure fitness test is being pilot tested as part of a new basic training curriculum component.
	Minnesota	License candidate must pass physical strength and agility based on agency's standards.
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Trainees (BLET) must pass POPAT (Police Officer Physical Abilities Test) during minimum 602 hour basic course.
	Ohio	Within a few months an "exit standard" based on Cooper standards will be in effect.
	Oklahoma	
	Utah	
	Vermont	Full-time only.
	Washington	
	Wyoming	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

20

<i>No</i>	Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
	Kansas	
	Maryland	The applicant must meet the standards of the agency.
	Missouri	We are currently working on funding for a Job Task Analysis.
	Nebraska	
	North Dakota	
	Oregon	
	Texas	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

10

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Pass Certification Exam following Basic Training

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	Under development.
	California	
	Florida	Refer to Chapter 943.13, F.S.
	Idaho	
	Michigan	200 questions, which includes unscored items under pilot testing.
	Minnesota	
	Missouri	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	New exam (2000) which now requires unit testing. Trainee must score a minimum of 70% on all 5 units.
	North Dakota	
	Ohio	70% on a 200 item test.
	Oklahoma	
	Texas	
	Utah	
	Vermont	
	Virginia	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

19

<i>No</i>	Arkansas	Only successful completion of state officer basic training.
	District of Columbia	Pass Academy exams with a score of 70% or higher.
	Indiana	We have no state certification.
	Kansas	
	Kentucky	Exit examinations are administered through basic training academies, tests are approved or component of curriculum.
	Maryland	Maryland has considered this. It would help confirm that minimal learning occurred.
	Nebraska	Pass all academic and physical skills test in the academy.
	Oregon	
	Washington	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	Successful completion of basic which includes all exams; then we certify.

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

11

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Examination by Licensed Physician

<i>Yes</i>	Alaska	
	Arizona	Physician must be trained by POST to be approved.
	Arkansas	
	California	
	District of Columbia	Includes drug screening.
	Florida	
	Idaho	
	Indiana	
	Kansas	
	Kentucky	
	Maryland	This is also usually necessary to get through an academy.
	Michigan	
	Minnesota	Standards set by employing agency.
	Nebraska	
	New Hampshire	
	New Mexico	
	New York	
	North Carolina	Exam required along with doctor's signature; however, medical standards are recommended, not mandated.
	North Dakota	
	Oregon	
	Texas	
	Utah	
	Vermont	
	Virginia	
	Wisconsin	
	Wyoming	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>		26

<i>No</i>	Missouri	
	Ohio	Determined locally.
	Oklahoma	
	Washington	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>		4

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Fingerprint with Search of State and Local Records

Yes

Alaska	
Arizona	
Arkansas	
California	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Idaho	
Indiana	
Kansas	
Kentucky	
Maryland	Critical! Also, NCIC or local files.
Michigan	
Minnesota	
Missouri	
Nebraska	
New Hampshire	
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	
Ohio	
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Texas	
Utah	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

28

No

North Dakota	
Washington	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

2

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Agency Conducts Oral Interview to Determine Suitability

Yes

Alaska	
Arkansas	
California	
Idaho	
Indiana	
Kentucky	Local Agency.
Maryland	This is to be used to assess the ability to communicate.
Michigan	To be conducted by the hiring agency.
Minnesota	
Nebraska	
New Hampshire	
New York	
North Carolina	Mandated for 30 years; unfortunately, often done as an afterthought or because NC requires.
Texas	
Wisconsin	
Wyoming	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes

16

No

Arizona	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Kansas	
Missouri	
New Mexico	
North Dakota	
Ohio	Determined locally.
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Utah	Done at department level with the exception of self-sponsored cadets.
Vermont	Optional for departments as part of background check.
Virginia	
Washington	

Total for Same/Similar Standard = No

14

POST Survey Results for the Standard: Cause Applicant to be Tested for Illicit Substances

Yes

Alaska	
California	
District of Columbia	
Florida	
Indiana	
Kentucky	
Maryland	Critical! We test for 7.
Michigan	Failure on the drug screen renders a candidate ineligible for two years.
New Mexico	
New York	
North Carolina	Should also apply to in-service officers on reasonable suspicion/random.
Texas	
Utah	10 Panel.
Wisconsin	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = Yes</i>	
<i>14</i>	

No

Arizona	We now require polygraph.
Arkansas	Hiring agency responsibility.
Idaho	Left to discretion of hiring agency.
Kansas	Agency requirement, not a state standard.
Minnesota	
Missouri	
Nebraska	Agency option. Very common.
New Hampshire	
North Dakota	
Ohio	Determined locally.
Oklahoma	
Oregon	
Vermont	
Virginia	
Washington	
Wyoming	
<i>Total for Same/Similar Standard = No</i>	
<i>16</i>	

POST Survey: Other Standards and Additional Comments on Existing Standards

- 1 Polygraph examination

- 2 The polygraph exam, while controversial, is the best tool we have.

- 3 Licensed psychologist is not required, but most agencies use one.

- 4 Ongoing standard that every officer notify CJ Standards Division of all criminal offenses the officer is arrested or charged with, pleads no contest or guilty to, or is found guilty of.

- 5 Affidavit from applicant.

- 6 Washington State utilizes Civil Service Commissions in the hiring process. Employment of law enforcement and corrections officers is the responsibility of the individual employing agencies, and is not a part of the Commission's responsibilities.

- 7 Background investigation according to protocols.

- 8 Maryland has regulations on the prior use of CDS and driver's records checks.

- 9 A good driving record.

- 10 Deferred adjudication in which probation is served.

***POST Survey Results for:
Methods Required to Screen Candidates for
Mental/Emotional Instabilities***

<i>State</i>	<i>Physician</i>	<i>Licensed Psychologist</i>	<i>Face-to-Face Interview</i>	<i>IACP Standards</i>	<i>IADLEST Standards</i>	<i>Standardized Tests:</i>
<i>Alaska</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Arizona</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Arkansas</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>California</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Florida</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Idaho</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Indiana</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Kansas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Kentucky</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LESI, Inc. (Greensboro, NC)
<i>Maryland</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Michigan</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Minnesota</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At psychologist's discretion.
<i>Missouri</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Nebraska</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New Hampshire</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MMPI
<i>New Mexico</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>New York</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>North Carolina</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>North Dakota</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Ohio</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Oklahoma</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Oregon</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Texas</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Utah</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Vermont</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Virginia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Washington</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Wisconsin</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Wyoming</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MMPI

MMPI-2

<i>Total Using:</i>	<i>Physician</i>	<i>Licensed Psychologist</i>	<i>Face-to-Face Interview</i>	<i>IACP Standards</i>	<i>IADLEST Standards</i>	<i>Standardized Tests:</i>
	9	14	9	1	0	8

POST Survey: States Requiring Psychological Screening for Non-Employed Police Recruits

<i>State</i>	<i>Resolution of ADA Prohibitions</i>
Alaska	
Idaho	Our job task analysis shows what is required to do the job.
Michigan	
Minnesota	Some screening before clinical skills college course.
New Mexico	Psychologist requires signed waiver in process to release information to academy.
North Dakota	State law requires for law enforcement.
Oklahoma	
Vermont	Sign-off by the potential candidate and the fact that no-one is treated differently. MMPI-2 is not used as the sole reason for disqualification.
Wyoming	No history.

Appendix E:
Law Enforcement Certification

POST Survey Results: Issuance of Initial Certification

<i>State</i>	<i>State Certifies/ Licenses Officers</i>	<i>Issued in Steps</i>	<i>Full Authority During Interim Certification</i>	<i>Requirements Before Full Authority/Certification Granted</i>
<i>Alaska</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Basic certificate requires academy plus one year of service with same agency.
<i>Arizona</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Arkansas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12 month probationary period.
<i>California</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Completion of the basic academy (664 hrs.), completion of mandatory field training program, complete department's probationary period. Must receive Basic POST by 18 months as a peace officer.
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Florida</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Idaho</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Complete basic academy, qualify on firearms, pass PT requirement, mandated field training program and minimum 6 months probationary period - all must be done within one year.
<i>Indiana</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Kansas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Kentucky</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sworn/Hire = Precertified status (up to 12 months). Completion of Basic Training = Certified status.
<i>Maryland</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The officer must meet selection (qualification) standards. If they carry a firearm, entrance level firearms training is required first. Entrance level training must be completed within one year.
<i>Michigan</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Completion of basic training or waiver program, and required standards screening by hiring agency.
<i>Minnesota</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Missouri</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Nebraska</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>New Hampshire</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<i>New Mexico</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>New York</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>North Carolina</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Meet all minimum employment/certification standards prior to issuance of Probationary Certification; serve 12 month probationary period; approval of agency head for General Certification.
<i>North Dakota</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Ohio</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Oklahoma</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Oregon</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Texas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Licensing is mandatory. Certification is optional. Basic certification takes one year.
<i>Utah</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Two blocks: Block #1 special functions officer (SFO). First 5 weeks of training, must pass certification exam to continue into law enforcement block (LEO), which is nine more weeks of training. Must pass second certification exam to have full authority.
<i>Vermont</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Virginia</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Washington</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Wisconsin</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Wyoming</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Total:				
30	27	9	7	

*Agencies Approving
Certification/License*

<i>State</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Commission</i>	<i>Employer</i>	<i>Other:</i>
<i>Alaska</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Arizona</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Arkansas</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>California</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Florida</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Idaho</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Indiana</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Kansas</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Kentucky</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Maryland</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Michigan</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Minnesota</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Missouri</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Nebraska</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New Hampshire</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New Mexico</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New York</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>North Carolina</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>North Dakota</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Ohio</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Oklahoma</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Oregon</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Texas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Utah</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Vermont</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Criminal Justice Training Council
<i>Virginia</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Washington</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Wisconsin</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Wyoming</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Total:				
30	12	19	7	1

<i>State</i>	<i>Time Limit on Valid License</i>	<i>Requirements for Renewal</i>
<i>Arizona</i>		For duration of appointment plus 3 years.
<i>California</i>		Must maintain continued professional training requirement of 24 hours every two years.
<i>Florida</i>	4 years	Must complete mandatory retraining.
<i>Idaho</i>	3 years	Certification remains active as long as they work a minimum of 120 hours per year. If not, expires after 3 years. Must then get employed and go through challenge program.
<i>Kansas</i>		Valid unless revoked, suspended, or if out of the profession more than five years.
<i>Kentucky</i>	1 year.	40 hours of in-service from a KY Law Enforcement Council approved curriculum.
<i>Maryland</i>	Every three years.	The officer must complete annual in-service and firearms training standards before renewal, which is done on a 3 year cycle, based on the month of birth.
<i>Minnesota</i>		48 hours of continuing education and a \$90 fee every three years.
<i>Missouri</i>		48 hours of continuing education every 3 years.
<i>New Hampshire</i>		It expires 30 days after they leave employment, or if they fail to complete mandatory annual training.
<i>New Mexico</i>		Firearms qualification each year; meet 40 hour biennial training requirement or certification can be revoked. After two-year break in service - 120 hour waiver course; after 8-year break - 800 hour basic course.
<i>North Dakota</i>	3 years	60 hours continuing education credit; annual sidearm qualification.
<i>Oregon</i>		Valid 90 days after resignation or retirement.
<i>Texas</i>		Expires if continuing education requirements are not met.
<i>Vermont</i>	Every year - must have update CEO.	Full-time certification: 25 hours CEO including firearms and first aid. Part-time certification: 30 hours CEO including firearms and first aid.
<i>Virginia</i>		Must maintain in-service training.

<i>Wisconsin</i>	See comments.	Certification expires when an officer leaves employment. If re-employed within 3 years, he/she may not be required by the Law Enforcement Standards Bureau to attend training to qualify for certification.
<i>Wyoming</i>		40 hours job related training every two years.

POST Survey Results: Advanced Certification Levels

States Reporting Intermediate Certification

<i>Alaska</i>	900 hours of training; 4 years service or associate degree.
<i>Arkansas</i>	Years of experience, training hours/points accrued, and six hours of college english at 2.0 GPA.
<i>California</i>	A full copy of the POST Administrative Manual is available on our website in a Microsoft Word format at www.post.ca.gov .
<i>Idaho</i>	Training, education and experience on a sliding scale, must possess Basic.
<i>New Mexico</i>	
<i>North Carolina</i>	Combination of full-time experience, law enforcement training points, education points, and/or college degree(s).
<i>Oklahoma</i>	Provided in brochure.
<i>Oregon</i>	Sliding scale by combination of experience, training point, and education points.
<i>Texas</i>	Basic Certificate, plus a sliding scale of training hours and education.

States Reporting Advanced Certification

<i>Alaska</i>	900 hours of training; 9 years service or bachelors degree with 4 years service.
<i>Arkansas</i>	Intermediate certification, additional years of experience, and additional college hours at 2.0 GPA.
<i>California</i>	A full copy of the POST Administrative Manual is available on our website in a Microsoft Word format at www.post.ca.gov .
<i>Idaho</i>	Training, education and experience on a sliding scale, but some college required. Must possess Intermediate.
<i>Michigan</i>	An advanced training certificate, based on the number of in-service hours attended.
<i>New Mexico</i>	
<i>North Carolina</i>	Combination of full-time experience, law enforcement training points, education points, and/or college degree(s); more stringent than Intermediate.
<i>Oklahoma</i>	Provided in brochure.
<i>Oregon</i>	Sliding scale by combination of experience, training point, and education points.

<i>Texas</i>	Intermediate Certificate, plus a sliding scale of training hours and education.
<i>Wyoming</i>	80 additional hours after basic or one year experience.

States Reporting Specialized Certification

<i>Arkansas</i>	successful completion of a course designed to fit specialized category.
<i>Idaho</i>	Master: Possess Advanced, have 15 years experience, 1,500 hours of training, not be in a supervisory/management position.
<i>Michigan</i>	Based on attendance of training programs within one designated category.
<i>Texas</i>	Jailer, telecommunicator, hypnosis, SFST, mental health, crime prevention, firearms, civil process. See Administrative Rules 221.5 to 221.25.

States Reporting Supervisory Certification

<i>California</i>	A full copy of the POST Administrative Manual is available on our website
<i>Idaho</i>	Possess Intermediate, complete 100 hours supervisory training (50 hours
<i>Maryland</i>	No certification, but first-line supervisors must complete a supervisor cour
<i>Michigan</i>	Based on attendance of a minimum number of first-line supervisor course
<i>Nebraska</i>	Attend Council approved supervisory training.
<i>New Mexico</i>	
<i>Oregon</i>	Advanced plus 45 education points, completion of prescribed Supervision
<i>Utah</i>	First line supervisor - 2 weeks.
<i>Washington</i>	

States Reporting Management/Executive Certification

<i>California</i>	
<i>Idaho</i>	Management: 100 hours management training, be in middle management position. Executive: 100 hours executive training (50 hours in last 3 years), be in executive position for 3 years.
<i>Michigan</i>	Based on attendance of a minimum number of first-line supervisor courses.

<i>Minnesota</i>	Minnesota POST is currently considering the possibility of having an added certificate for police chiefs and sheriffs who receive specialized training.
<i>Nebraska</i>	Attend Council approved management training.
<i>New Mexico</i>	
<i>Oregon</i>	Mgmt.: Supv. plus 90 educ. points, plus Middle Mgmt. course, employed in Middle Mgmt. position or higher. Exec.: Mgmt. plus 90 educ. points, 100 hours of executive level training, employed and satisfactorily performed in Mid-Mgmt. or higher for 2 years.
<i>Texas</i>	Under Law Enforcement Management Institute.
<i>Washington</i>	

States Reporting Instructor Certification

<i>Alaska</i>	MOI class and approved lesson plan. Also requires approval from chief.
<i>Arkansas</i>	40 hour Instructor Development program.
<i>Idaho</i>	3 years experience, complete POST instructor course, be evaluated by POST staff, submit lesson plan.
<i>Maryland</i>	Regular, firearms, and EVOC instructors must complete appropriate courses to be certified.
<i>Michigan</i>	Currently only in certain areas, such as firearms, RADAR, and Domestic Violence.
<i>Minnesota</i>	Not a separate category of license for instructors, but instructors may obtain credit for teaching as part of their own continuing education department.
<i>Nebraska</i>	Attend 40 hour instructor development except for skills instructors (firearms) which is a separate certification or legal instructor must be a graduate of a law school.
<i>New Hampshire</i>	Must be chosen to instruct at an academy and have training and experience in the area to be instructed, plus complete an Instructor Development class or have substantial teaching experience.
<i>New Mexico</i>	
<i>North Carolina</i>	General Instructor Certification required to instruct Commission-accredited courses. Specialized Instructor Certification for instructing high-liability areas (firearms, driving, physical fitness, etc.).
<i>North Dakota</i>	Approved methods of instruction course and minimum of 2 years as a peace officer.
<i>Oklahoma</i>	Provided in brochure.
<i>Oregon</i>	
<i>Texas</i>	

<i>Utah</i>	Instructor development - 1 week.
<i>Vermont</i>	In various areas. Expertise, advanced classes, instructor development, annual or other recertification.
<i>Virginia</i>	
<i>Washington</i>	
<i>Wisconsin</i>	

States Reporting Other Certification Types

<i>Idaho</i>	Level 1 reserve, marine deputy, K-9, detention, communication specialist, juvenile parole, juvenile detention.
<i>Maryland</i>	No certification, but first-line administrators must complete an administrator course within one year of promotion.
<i>North Carolina</i>	Radar and other speed measuring instrument operators/instructors must be certified to utilize Radar/SMI in N.C.
<i>Texas</i>	Master: Advanced Certificate, plus a sliding scale of training hours and education.
<i>Vermont</i>	FTO. Two years experience, 40 hour FTO school, recommendation of Chief, Sheriff, etc.
<i>Wyoming</i>	Professional: 80 additional hours after Advanced plus three additional years experience.

Comments on Certification/Licensing

<i>Alaska</i>	If you allow civilians to be certified as instructors, I recommend that you include some language in your regulations to show that the POST owns the certificate and no property right is held by the instructor. (This way you do not have to conduct a full-blown hearing to take it away.)
<i>Arkansas</i>	Existing levels in Arkansas: Basic, General, Intermediate, Advanced, Senior, Part-Time I (20-39 hours per week), Part-Time II (0-20 hours per week), Auxiliary (volunteer), Specialized, Adv. IT Probation, RADAR, and Juvenile. Instructor levels of Professional (LEO), General, Firearms, FTO, and RADAR.
<i>California</i>	Establish reasonable and achievable standards based on education, experience, on the job and continued training.
<i>Idaho</i>	Please review our rules at www.idaho-post.org . Go to administrative rules, section 106 for career level certification or 050 for minimum standards for employment.
<i>Kentucky</i>	Legislation pending to create multiple advanced certification.

<i>Maryland</i>	In Maryland, an individual must be employed by a law enforcement unit to be certified. If the person terminates, certification ends. If the person is employed by a new police agency, the person must meet the selection and training standards for recertification. You should consider this approach when considering certification, as it reduces the chance of unsuitable persons jumping from agency to agency. Also we recommend that an academy be completed before certification. We are also considering regulations to require 80 hours of field training before certification.
<i>Minnesota</i>	Because Minnesota is a licensing agency and the license must be renewed periodically, having graduated licenses would add layers of detail to our current record system that would create problems that do not justify the benefits. The concept itself has been discussed by our board for the last 15 years, and the conclusion has been that it is not necessary, given the type of licensing system we have.
<i>Nebraska</i>	Let us know if you succeed as we are considering something similar in the distant future.
<i>New Mexico</i>	Re. Advanced certification levels, visit www.dps.nm.org/training for all administrative rules.
<i>North Carolina</i>	Our Professional Certificate Program has 3 levels of awards: Basic, Intermediate and Advanced. Those are voluntary awards which officers can apply for/qualify for if they meet the minimum requirements. Very popular program in N.C. which many agencies utilize to provide raises or promotions for their officers.
<i>Ohio</i>	Reference question #6 (time restriction on license), we work on a "break fin service" basis. If an officer is not employed for up to one year, they must complete any state mandated training that may have come into effect since their basic training. If not employed from 1-4 years, a two week refresher course must be completed. If unemployed for over 4 years, they must complete basic training again.
<i>Texas</i>	Many agencies have incentive pay programs for certifications. We have not addressed renewal issue.
<i>Vermont</i>	I believe it is strongly needed, however, with the amount of turnover and the need for officers I do not see it in Vermont for a long time. We are not a POST state so therefore, do not have as strong a control as is necessary to make rules.
<i>Virginia</i>	We have no experience in this. However, as with most issues, the more you add the more it becomes an administrative nightmare for the agency.
<i>Washington</i>	Please visit our web site at www.cjic.state.wa.us for additional information on all information checked above.
<i>Wyoming</i>	College degrees enter our system between Advanced and Professional - example: 2 year degree officer needs just 40 hours after advanced certificate and 2 years experience. A four year degree officer needs 0 hours training and only one year experience to become Professional. A dissenting opinion is that college degrees should never offset experience - only training hours.

POST Agencies Having or Researching Academy Accreditation

Yes-Have

1	Alaska	Irl T. Stambaugh	Director, Alaska Police Standards Council	(907) 465-5523
2	Arizona	Lynn Larson	Basic Training Manager	(602) 223-2514
3	California	Ed Pecinorsky	Senior Consultant, Training Delivery Bureau	(916) 227-4873
4	Maryland	Patrick Bradley	Deputy Director	(410) 750-6524
5	Minnesota	Dan Glass	License and Testing Coordinator	
6	New Mexico	Mark Damitro	Deputy Director NM POST	(505) 827-9265
7	North Carolina	Stephanie Freeman	Training Specialist	(919) 716-6470
8	Ohio	Vernon Chenevey	Director	(614) 728-5140
9	Oklahoma	Gary James	Supervisor, Standards Division	(405) 425-2444
10	Oregon	Mike Fielding	Supervisor, Accreditation Section	(503) 378-4888
11	Texas	steve Glenn	Program Specialist	(512) 936-7700
12	Virginia	John Byrd	Criminal Justice Program Administrator	(804) 786-6375

Yes-Researching

1	Kansas			
2	Michigan	Danny Rosa	Field Representative	(517) 322-6449
3	Washington	Carri Brezonick	Manager	(206) 835-7341
4	Wisconsin	Dennis E. Hanson	Director	(608) 266-7864

Appendix F:
Waiver of Training

***Waiver of Training Survey:
Program Results in Preparing for Certification Exam and
Law Enforcement Officer Duties***

Candidate: Waiver Program Prepared for Certification Exam

<i>Type of Candidate</i>	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Minimally</i>	<i>Total</i>
Out of State	2	4	2		8
Pre-Service	1	6			7
Previously MI Cert	6	1			7
<i>Total</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>2</i>		<i>22</i>

Candidate: Waiver Program Prepared for Duties as LEO

<i>Type of Candidate</i>	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Minimally</i>	<i>Total</i>
Out of State	2	3	1	2	8
Pre-Service		6	1		7
Previously MI Cert	3	4			7
<i>Total</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>22</i>

Supervisor: Waiver Program Prepared for Duties as LEO

<i>Type of Candidate</i>	<i>Very Well</i>	<i>Well</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Minimally</i>	<i>Total</i>
Out of State	7	5	1	1	14
Pre-Service	1	3	2		6
Previously MI Cert	8	5			13
<i>Total</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>33</i>

***Waiver of Training Survey:
Additional Classroom Training and Field Training
Provided Upon Hire***

Agencies Providing Additional Classroom Training Upon Employment

<i>Additional Classroom Training Provided</i>	<i>Agencies Reporting</i>	<i>Average Hours Provided</i>	<i>Minimum Hours Provided</i>	<i>Maximum Hours Provided</i>
Yes	30	47.4	4	160
No	9			

Agencies Providing Field Training Upon Employment

<i>Field Training Provided</i>	<i>Agencies Reporting</i>	<i>Number of Weeks Provided</i>	<i>Minimum Weeks Provided</i>	<i>Maximum Weeks Provided</i>
Yes	26	9.5	3	17
No	15			

***Waiver of Training Survey:
Supervisor Response to Maximum Time Out of Service***

<i>No</i>		6
-----------	--	---

	<i>Total</i>	<i>6</i>
--	---------------------	-----------------

<i>Yes</i>	1	2
------------	---	---

	2	18
--	---	----

	3	6
--	---	---

	5	4
--	---	---

	7	1
--	---	---

	10	2
--	----	---

	<i>Total</i>	<i>33</i>
--	---------------------	------------------

Appendix G:

**Continued Law Enforcement
In-Service Training**

Agency Survey Results: In-Service Training Reported

Agencies Reporting In-Service Training Required or Provided

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
College/University	4	6	3			13
Municipal	87	57	27	10	2	183
Other	3	3	1			7
Sheriff	3	22	10	7	1	43
State	1	8	3		10	22
Township	22	16	10			48
<i>Total</i>	120	112	54	17	13	316

Agencies Reporting In-Service Training NOT Required or Provided

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Municipal	3					3
Sheriff		2				2
State			1			1
Township	2					2
<i>Total</i>	5	2	1			8

Average In-Service Hours by Agency Type and Size

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>Number of Officers</i>	<i>Number of Agencies</i>	<i>Average Hours per Year</i>	<i>Minimum Reported</i>	<i>Maximum Reported</i>
College/University	<i>1-10</i>	4	22.7	8	40
	<i>11-29</i>	6	21.6	16	24
	<i>30-99</i>	3	48.0	36	60
Municipal	<i>1-10</i>	87	32.3	5	100
	<i>11-29</i>	57	41.2	5	160
	<i>30-99</i>	27	53.1	16	120
	<i>100-200</i>	10	45.4	24	80
	<i>201+</i>	2	28.0	16	40
Other	<i>1-10</i>	3	40.0	40	40
	<i>11-29</i>	3	60.0	40	100
	<i>30-99</i>	1	60.0	60	60
Sheriff	<i>1-10</i>	3	23.0	16	30
	<i>11-29</i>	22	29.1	3	60
	<i>30-99</i>	10	42.8	8	120
	<i>100-200</i>	7	34.7	12	43
	<i>201+</i>	1	48.0	48	48
State	<i>1-10</i>	1	24.0	24	24
	<i>11-29</i>	8	30.7	10	40
	<i>30-99</i>	3	32.5	25	40

	<i>201+</i>	10	25.8	16	50
<hr/>					
Township					
	<i>1-10</i>	22	42.1	8	96
	<i>11-29</i>	16	35.4	20	75
	<i>30-99</i>	10	116.4	10	800
<hr/>					

Recommended Core Training Topics vs. Recent Training Reported

<i>Recommended Core Training</i>			<i>Recent Training Provided</i>		
<i>Core Training Topics</i>	<i>Agencies Reporting</i>		<i>Recent Training Topics</i>	<i>Agencies Reporting</i>	
1	Firearms	277	1	Firearms	261
2	Legal Updates	254	2	Legal Updates	239
3	EVO/Defensive Driving	185	3	First Aid/CPR/AED	204
4	First Aid/CPR/AED	177	4	Subject Control	161
5	Subject Control	168	5	EVO/Defensive Driving	112
6	Use of Force-Scenarios	72	6	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	90
7	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	61	7	Blood/Airborne Pathogens	85
8	Blood/Airborne Pathogens	55	8	Use of Force-Scenarios	59
9	Domestic Violence	46	9	Domestic Violence	49
10	Patrol Procedures	33	10	Traffic Law/Procedures	44
11	Specialized Investigations	25	11	Patrol Procedures	39
12	Traffic Law/Procedures	25	12	Department-Specific	35
13	Interview/Interrogation	24	13	Alcohol/Drugs	27
14	Alcohol/Drugs	20	14	Chemical Weapons	24
15	Evidence	19	15	Other	22
16	Diversity/Profiling Issues	16	16	Diversity/Profiling Issues	22
17	Community Policing/Problem Solvin	16	17	Evidence	22
18	Other	16	18	School/Workplace Violence	18
19	Interpersonal Communication	14	19	Liability Block Training	14
20	Report Writing	14	20	Interview/Interrogation	13
21	Accident Investigation	13	21	Specialized Investigations	10
22	Liability Block Training	12	22	Accident Investigation	9
23	Ethics	11	23	Report Writing	8
24	Chemical Weapons	9	24	Computer/Technology Use	8
25	School/Workplace Violence	6	25	Supervision/Management	6
26	Mobilized Field Force	5	26	Community Policing/Problem Solving	5
27	Department-Specific	5	27	Interpersonal Communication	5
28	Computer/Technology Use	5	28	Incident Command	4
29	Terrorism Awareness/Response	5	29	Mobilized Field Force	3
30	Incident Command	5	30	Ethics	2
31	Supervision/Management	4	31	Weapons of Mass Destruction/Explo	2

Availability of Recommended Core Training Topics by Agency Type

<i>Core Topic</i>	<i>College/University</i>	<i>Municipal</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Sheriff</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Township</i>	<i>Overall</i>
Accident Investigation	3.0	3.2	2.0	3.3		4.0	3.1
Alcohol/Drugs		3.4	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.5	3.1
Blood/Airborne Pathogens	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5		4.7	4.7
Chemical Weapons		4.3		5.0		5.0	4.8
Community Policing/Problem Solving		2.2	3.0			3.5	2.9
Computer/Technology Use		2.0	5.0	3.5			3.5
Department-Specific		4.3		5.0		5.0	4.8
Diversity/Profiling Issues	2.0	3.1	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5
Domestic Violence	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.1	2.0	4.0	3.8
Ethics		2.3		2.3		2.0	2.2
Evidence		3.7	2.0	3.2		3.3	3.0
EVO/Defensive Driving	3.7	3.4	2.5	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3
Firearms	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.6	5.0	4.6	4.8
First Aid/CPR/AED	4.7	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.9	4.4	4.7
Haz-Mat/Biohazard	4.5	4.3	3.0	4.1	5.0	4.0	4.2
Incident Command		3.5	4.0				3.8
Interpersonal Communication	2.0	2.1	2.0	5.0	1.0	2.5	2.4
Interview/Interrogation	5.0	3.7	2.0	3.3		2.8	3.4
Legal Updates	4.2	4.1	3.4	4.4	4.3	4.0	4.1
Liability Block Training	5.0	4.0		3.5		4.0	4.1
Mobilized Field Force	3.0	2.0	2.0	5.0			3.0
Other	5.0	3.4		3.7	3.0	4.3	3.9
Patrol Procedures	3.0	3.4		3.4	3.7	3.6	3.4
Report Writing		2.6	2.0	5.0	2.0	3.7	3.0
School/Workplace Violence		2.7	2.0	5.0		5.0	3.7
Specialized Investigations	4.0	3.2		2.3	5.0	3.8	3.7
Subject Control	5.0	4.1	5.0	4.4	5.0	3.7	4.5
Supervision/Management	4.0		4.0			5.0	4.3
Terrorism Awareness/Response		3.0					3.0
Traffic Law/Procedures		3.0		4.2	5.0	4.0	4.0
Use of Force-Scenarios	4.0	4.1	3.0	3.9	5.0	3.8	4.0

Note: Availability was rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 representing "Readily Available" and 1 representing "Not Available."

Availability of Recommended Core Training Topics by Agency Size

<i>Core Topic</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Overall</i>
Accident Investigation	2.7	3.3	5.0	2.0		3.2
Alcohol/Drugs	3.4	3.0	4.0		3.0	3.4
Blood/Airborne Pathogens	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Chemical Weapons	3.7	4.8	5.0		5.0	4.6
Community Policing/Problem Solving	2.8	2.7	2.8			2.8
Computer/Technology Use	5.0	2.0	3.0			3.3
Department-Specific		4.3		5.0	5.0	4.8
Diversity/Profiling Issues	4.0	2.6	3.6	5.0	4.0	3.8
Domestic Violence	4.0	4.1	4.0		2.0	3.5
Ethics	2.0	2.4	2.0			2.1
Evidence	3.5	3.4	2.0			3.0
EVO/Defensive Driving	3.0	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.3	3.4
Firearms	4.5	4.8	4.8	4.5	5.0	4.7
First Aid/CPR/AED	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.6
Haz-Mat/Biohazard	4.0	4.1	4.6	4.5	5.0	4.4
Incident Command	5.0	1.0	3.5			3.2
Interpersonal Communication	1.6	3.8	1.3	4.0	1.0	2.3
Interview/Interrogation	3.8	3.3	2.5			3.2
Legal Updates	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2
Liability Block Training	3.0	4.3	4.0			3.8
Mobilized Field Force	2.0	4.0	1.0			2.3
Other	3.6	3.0	4.3	5.0	3.5	3.9
Patrol Procedures	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.8	3.5
Report Writing	2.8	2.6	2.3	4.5		3.0
School/Workplace Violence	3.3	5.0		2.0		3.4
Specialized Investigations	3.6	3.5	1.5			2.9
Subject Control	3.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	5.0	4.4
Supervision/Management	5.0	5.0	4.0			4.7
Terrorism Awareness/Response	2.0	5.0	2.5			3.2
Traffic Law/Procedures	2.8	3.9	4.6	5.0		4.1
Use of Force-Scenarios	3.5	4.3	4.7	5.0	4.0	4.3

Note: Availability was rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 representing "Readily Available" and 1 representing "Not Available."

Recommended Timely Training Topics vs. Recent Training Reported

<i>Recommended Timely Training</i>			<i>Recent Training Provided</i>		
<i>Timely Training Topic</i>	<i>Agencies Reporting</i>		<i>Recent Training</i>		<i>Agencies Reporting</i>
1	Terrorism Awareness/Response	150	1	Firearms	261
2	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	55	2	Legal Updates	239
3	Incident Command	49	3	First Aid/CPR/AED	204
4	Internet/Identity Crimes	48	4	Subject Control	161
5	Legal Updates	45	5	EVO/Defensive Driving	112
6	School/Workplace Violence	45	6	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	90
7	Diversity/Profiling Issues	42	7	Blood/Airborne Pathogens	85
8	Alcohol/Drugs	36	8	Use of Force-Scenarios	59
9	Weapons of Mass Destruction/Explo	30	9	Domestic Violence	49
10	Other	29	10	Traffic Law/Procedures	44
11	Evidence	28	11	Patrol Procedures	39
12	Domestic Violence	24	12	Department-Specific	35
13	Interview/Interrogation	23	13	Alcohol/Drugs	27
14	Computer/Technology Use	22	14	Chemical Weapons	24
15	Patrol Procedures	19	15	Other	22
16	Subject Control	16	16	Diversity/Profiling Issues	22
17	Specialized Investigations	14	17	Evidence	22
18	Community Policing/Problem Solving	13	18	School/Workplace Violence	18
19	EVO/Defensive Driving	13	19	Liability Block Training	14
20	Use of Force-Scenarios	12	20	Interview/Interrogation	13
21	Mobilized Field Force	11	21	Specialized Investigations	10
22	Traffic Law/Procedures	10	22	Accident Investigation	9
23	Supervision/Management	9	23	Report Writing	8
24	Firearms	9	24	Computer/Technology Use	8
25	Ethics	8	25	Supervision/Management	6
26	First Aid/CPR/AED	8	26	Community Policing/Problem Solving	5
27	Interpersonal Communication	7	27	Interpersonal Communication	5
28	Report Writing	6	28	Incident Command	4
29	Accident Investigation	5	29	Mobilized Field Force	3
30	Liability Block Training	4	30	Ethics	2
31	Blood/Airborne Pathogens	3	31	Weapons of Mass Destruction/Explos	2
32	Department-Specific	2			

Availability of Recommended Timely Training Topics by Agency Type

<i>Timely Training</i>	<i>College/University</i>	<i>Municipal</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Sheriff</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Township</i>	<i>Overall</i>
Accident Investigation		2.0			4.5		3.3
Alcohol/Drugs	3.0	3.1	2.0	2.4	3.0	3.3	2.8
Blood/Airborne Pathogens				5.0	3.0		4.0
Community Policing/Problem Solving		2.8		3.0		2.5	2.8
Computer/Technology Use	1.5	2.8		3.0	3.5	2.4	2.6
Department-Specific		5.0					5.0
Diversity/Profiling Issues	2.0	2.8	2.0	2.8	3.3	3.5	2.7
Domestic Violence	3.0	4.2		3.2	4.0	3.6	3.6
Ethics	1.0	2.8			1.5		1.8
Evidence		2.7		2.0	3.7	3.0	2.9
EVO/Defensive Driving		3.3	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.1
Firearms		2.3			5.0	4.8	4.0
First Aid/CPR/AED		3.0			5.0	3.0	3.7
Haz-Mat/Biohazard	3.0	2.8		2.9	3.0	2.5	2.9
Incident Command	2.3	2.9	3.8	3.6	2.3	2.5	2.9
Internet/Identity Crimes	3.3	2.2	2.0	2.8	2.7	1.3	2.4
Interpersonal Communication		2.3		4.0			3.2
Interview/Interrogation		3.3		3.3	3.1	3.7	3.3
Legal Updates	3.3	3.3	2.7	4.5	4.3	2.7	3.5
Liability Block Training		3.0			1.0	2.0	2.0
Mobilized Field Force		3.6			3.0	2.5	3.0
Other	2.5	2.5		2.3	1.0	3.0	2.3
Patrol Procedures		3.2	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.7	2.2
Report Writing		2.8		2.0		1.0	1.9
School/Workplace Violence	3.0	3.2	5.0	2.9	4.0	4.1	3.7
Specialized Investigations	1.0	2.8		3.5	3.0	2.5	2.6
Subject Control		3.2		3.0	5.0	2.8	3.5
Supervision/Management	4.0	3.3		3.0		2.3	3.1
Terrorism Awareness/Response	2.9	2.5	2.0	2.6	2.5	3.2	2.6
Traffic Law/Procedures		3.5		4.0			3.8
Use of Force-Scenarios		3.3				2.2	2.7
Weapons of Mass Destruction/Explo	3.0	2.9	1.0	3.1	1.0	2.2	2.2

Note: Availability was rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 representing "Readily Available" and 1 representing "Not Available."

Availability of Recommended Timely Training Topics by Agency Size

<i>Timely Training</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Overall</i>
Accident Investigation		3.0	2.0		4.0	3.0
Alcohol/Drugs	3.1	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.0
Blood/Airborne Pathogens		4.0				4.0
Community Policing/Problem Solving	2.0	2.3	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0
Computer/Technology Use	2.3	2.5	3.5		3.3	2.9
Department-Specific			5.0			5.0
Diversity/Profiling Issues	2.6	2.3	2.9	3.3	3.3	2.9
Domestic Violence	4.4	3.7	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.7
Ethics	2.0	2.0	1.5	5.0	2.0	2.5
Evidence	3.1	2.5	2.3		3.0	2.7
EVO/Defensive Driving	2.3	4.2	2.3	4.0		3.2
Firearms	3.8	3.7	3.0	4.0		3.6
First Aid/CPR/AED	2.0	3.5	5.0			3.5
Haz-Mat/Biohazard	2.2	2.7	3.5	4.0		3.1
Incident Command	2.6	2.7	3.2	3.8	2.0	2.8
Internet/Identity Crimes	2.3	2.3	2.4	3.0	2.0	2.4
Interpersonal Communication	2.0	1.3		4.0		2.4
Interview/Interrogation	3.6	3.1	3.3		3.0	3.2
Legal Updates	3.0	3.6	3.1	4.5	3.5	3.5
Liability Block Training	3.0		2.0		1.0	2.0
Mobilized Field Force	3.5	3.0	2.8	4.3		3.4
Other	3.4	2.0	2.4			2.6
Patrol Procedures	3.1	2.1		4.0	3.0	3.1
Report Writing	5.0	1.0	2.0			2.7
School/Workplace Violence	3.4	2.9	3.4	4.0	3.5	3.4
Specialized Investigations	2.8	2.5	4.0		3.0	3.1
Subject Control	2.3	3.6	1.0	4.0		2.7
Supervision/Management	2.0	2.7	3.7		3.0	2.8
Terrorism Awareness/Response	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.5	2.6	2.8
Traffic Law/Procedures	3.8	3.5	3.0	4.0		3.6
Use of Force-Scenarios	2.0	2.3	3.8	4.0		3.0
Weapons of Mass Destruction/Explo	2.3	2.1	3.1	3.3		2.7

Note: Availability was rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 5 representing "Readily Available" and 1 representing "Not Available."

Agency Survey Results: Reported Recommendations for Grant Focus

Issue

1	Consortium/Multiple Agency	35
2	Small Agency Training/Funding	28
3	History of Grant Course	23
4	Core Training Programs	18
5	Agency Training Funding	15
6	Geographic Availability of Training	14
7	Special Enforcement Projects	13
8	Equipment	11
9	Direct Funding to Agencies/LED	11
10	Certification/Standards Compliance	10
11	Timely Training Topics	9
12	Computer/Technology Use	5
13	Other	4
14	Availability of Training	4
15	High-Liability Training Courses	1
16	Ethics	1
17	School Resource Officer	1
18	Specialized Investigation	1

Total Number Reporting: 204

Course

1	Legal Updates/Issues	35
2	Terrorism Awareness	34
3	EVO/Defensive Driving	34
4	Firearms Training	18
5	Use of Force/Scenario Training	16
6	Domestic Violence	15
7	Evidence Training	14
8	Incident Command/Emergency Response	14
9	Alcohol/Drug Issues	12
10	Diversity/Profiling	12
11	Patrol Operations	12
12	Community Policing/Problem Solving	11

Course

13	Other	10
14	Haz-Mat/Biohazard	10
15	Subject Control	9
16	Supervision/Management Courses	8
17	Internet/Identity Crimes	8
18	Weapons of Mass Destruction/Explosives	8
19	Specialized Investigation	7
20	Interpersonal Communications	6
21	Interview and Interrogation	6
22	School/Workplace Violence	6
23	Accident Investigation	6
24	Computer/Technology Use	6
25	High-Liability Training Courses	5
26	First Aid/CPR/AED Training	4
27	Ethics	4
28	School Resource Officer	3
29	Traffic Law/Enforcement Training	3
30	Report Writing	2
31	Direct Funding to Agencies/LED	1
32	Timely Training Topics	1
33	Special Enforcement Projects	1

Total Number Reporting: 341

Agency Survey Results: Reported Training Consortia Listing

Consortium Membership by Agency Type and Size:

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
College/University	2	3				5
Municipal	43	39	18	7	1	108
Other	1	2				3
Sheriff	3	18	7	5	1	34
State		3			1	4
Township	8	6	4			18
<i>Total</i>	57	71	29	12	3	172

1	Central West Michigan Law Enforcement Training Consortium	Frank West	(231) 591-2710	5
2	Clinton County Consortium	Sergeant Steve Nobis	(989) 224-5203	3
3	Delta Community College	Jill Gallihugh	(989) 616-9108	8
4	Down-River Mutual Aid Task Force	Chief Tom Bonner, Taylor Police Department		3
5	EMPCO, Inc.	John Higgins	(248) 528-8060	1
6	Hillsdale County Law Enforcement Training Center	Undersheriff JJ Hodshire	(517) 437-7317	3
7	Huron County Training Commission	Sergeant Dave Dausses (sp?)	(989) 269-6421	1
8	Ingham County Sheriff's Office	Sergeant Matt Flint	(517) 676-8221	1
9	Kellogg Community College	Linda Lovchuk	(616) 965-3931	6
10	Kirtland Community College	Jerry Boerma	(989) 275-5000	18
11	Lake Superior State University	Eugene VenderKoi	(906) 632-6841	2
12	Lakes Area Training Consortium	Director Jerry Walker, Walled Lake PD	(248) 960-2045	2

13	Law Enforcement Officers Regional Training Consortium	Charles Monroe	(810) 766-7222	21
14	Macomb Community College	James Mietling	(586) 498-4051	18
15	MAGLOCLLEN	Mark Smith	(517) 789-7973	1
16	Muskegon Area Training Council	Cindy Panici	(231) 777-0227	6
17	Northern Michigan University Public Safety Institute	Kenneth A. Chant	(906) 346-4504	18
18	Northwestern Michigan College	Mike Cochran	(231) 995-1922	6
19	Oakland Community College		(248) 232-4220	2
20	Region II Planning			1
21	Regional Community Policing Institute	MSU School of Criminal Justice	(517) 355-9618	1
22	Schoolcraft College	Todd Scott	(734) 462-4782	2
23	South Bend, IN, Regional Training	Captain Ronald Marcinak	(219) 235-9224	1
24	Southeast Michigan Criminal Justice Training Consortium	Lieutenant William Dunbar	(734) 941-2222	3
25	Wayne County Metropolitan Airport	Sally Wright	(734) 942-5360	1
26	Wayne County Regional Police Training Center	Robert Pearce		3
27	West Central Michigan Criminal Justice Training Consortium	Undersheriff Dale Vredevelde	(616) 738-4002	22

Agency Survey Results: Reported Training Budgets

Average Reported Training Allotment Per Officer

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>Overall</i>
College/University	\$66.07	\$205.01	\$190.77		\$158.97
Municipal	\$279.34	\$387.62	\$645.10	\$258.84	\$360.54
Other	\$550.37	\$227.27			\$469.60
Sheriff	\$250.00	\$201.59	\$272.11	\$250.12	\$231.34
Township	\$363.44	\$254.71	\$365.74		\$327.66

<i>Full Time Officers</i>	<i>Part Time Officers</i>	<i>Total In-Service Budgets</i>	<i>Total Average Allotment per Officer</i>
6,722	536	\$2,856,258.00	\$393.53

Average Reported Training Cost Per Hour of Training

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>Overall</i>
College/University	\$10.89	\$9.10	\$4.00		\$7.93
Municipal	\$10.98	\$12.68	\$16.06	\$5.99	\$11.84
Other	\$13.76	\$5.68			\$11.74
Sheriff	\$14.58	\$7.60	\$9.59	\$9.84	\$9.05
Township	\$11.33	\$8.87	\$9.67		\$10.22

<i>Total Training Hours</i>	<i>Total In-Service Budgets</i>	<i>Total Average Cost Per Hour</i>
285,872	\$2,303,776.00	\$8.06

Note 1: State agencies were excluded due to all State Police Districts and Posts being included in the survey.

Note 2: Total in-service budget figure differs, as some records were eliminated for each table due to null values.

***Agency Survey Results:
Methods for Providing Continued Law Enforcement
Services While Officers In Training***

College/University	<i>1-10</i>	3	3	1	0	0
	<i>11-29</i>	6	3	0	0	1
	<i>30-99</i>	3	1	0	0	0
Municipal	<i>1-10</i>	51	24	2	23	7
	<i>11-29</i>	33	31	8	2	7
	<i>30-99</i>	24	19	3	1	2
	<i>100-200</i>	6	7	1	0	1
	<i>201+</i>	2	1	0	0	0
Other	<i>1-10</i>	1	0	0	0	2
	<i>11-29</i>	3	0	1	0	0
	<i>30-99</i>	1	1	0	0	0
Sheriff	<i>1-10</i>	3	0	0	1	0
	<i>11-29</i>	21	9	3	3	3
	<i>30-99</i>	9	3	0	4	0
	<i>100-200</i>	3	4	3	0	0
	<i>201+</i>	0	1	1	0	0
State	<i>1-10</i>	1	0	0	0	0
	<i>11-29</i>	7	3	1	2	2
	<i>30-99</i>	4	0	0	0	0
	<i>201+</i>	10	0	0	1	0
Township	<i>1-10</i>	10	4	1	13	1
	<i>11-29</i>	14	9	5	0	1
	<i>30-99</i>	7	6	3	0	1
<i>Total</i>		<i>222</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>28</i>

Agency Survey Results:

Agencies Registering Courses or Using Computer Courses

Agencies Registering Courses with MCOLES through TC-34 Process

College/University	2	3				5
Municipal	44	20	14	2	1	81
Other	2	1	1			4
Sheriff		12	2	2		16
State	1	4	2		9	16
Township	9	8	6			23
Total	58	48	25	4	10	145

Agencies Reporting Use of Computer-Based Training Courses

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
College/University	3	2	1			6
Municipal	17	15	7	2		41
Other		1	1			2
Sheriff	1	5	4	1		11
State		4	1		5	10
Township	4	5	1			10
Total	25	32	15	3	5	80

Agency Survey Results:

Comments on In-Service Training

College/University

1-10

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Standards for "In-service." |
|---|-----------------------------|

11-29

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Should be allowed to use good out of state training sites. |
| 2 | Set up a standard program throughout the state. Tell us what is mandatory and how many hours should be required annually. |
| 3 | Mandated training to ensure all officers are receiving the same training. Encourage regional (consortium) training sessions. |

30-99

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Fitness standards and training should be maintained throughout officers career. Would reduce various claims such as excessive force. In-service standards would improve the professionalism of Michigan LE officers and should reduce litigation. |
|---|---|
-

Municipal

1-10

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | <p>Re question 10: Decide if we are going to have required or mandated training to keep an officer's certification active or current. If the answer is yes, what topics/subjects will be required - spend the 3 million on these topics.</p> <p>1. Legal updates - need to know what can or cannot or must be enforced. Need to know how to do it - procedural requirements.</p> <p>2. Use of force. Less time and emphasis on shooting - more on talking to people and non-lethal force. Communications skills to diffuse issues.</p> <p>3. Ethics and community - do we view our community and citizens as people we provide service to or people we police and enforce the law. Emphasis has shifted from being a peace officer to a law enforcement officer. I believe if we can get out of the mindset that we just enforce the law to that we strive to provide a safe community we will have less conflict with citizens. I believe it would affect use of force, racial profiling issues, etc.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Re question 10:</p> <p>1. Need - how much training has a department received in the past year and is the reason for lack of training financial.</p> <p>2. Ability to train or include other departments in training sessions.</p> <p>(Question 3a: Coordinator phone ext. 4006)</p> |
| 3 | <p>Re question 10: My department is very small and busy. Grants are extremely hard to expend especially for training due to both manpower issues and geographic issues relative to trainers and training sites.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Require continuing education via internet.</p> |

5	<p>Set up a list by lawsuit issue and train to that standard, this info should bar assoc.</p> <p>Re question 10: Funding should go direct to dept. Avoid the middleman. Mandate or allow funding for cross dept training; I.e. send Podunk to Flint for FTO then back to Podunk.</p>
6	The process and hours of training should be phased in.
7	We would like some of the training to be conducted locally, because at times it is more difficult to travel the distance for the training. Once a year we receive information on the seminars that are available. Agencies are not properly trained on these issues. We feel training needs to be set in these areas for officers in the field.
8	I believe "CEUs" should be required somewhere between 40-60 hours year. However, as always, funding becomes an issue especially with the smaller agencies. Unfunded mandates are becoming a real drain on municipal resources - "Catch-22."
9	Make sure - somehow- that all training is recorded at MCOLES. Still is a big problem - many good training programs do not report to MCOLES.
10	Must be affordable to small police departments - the best training in the world is no good if it is cost prohibitive.
11	The OSHA requirement for annual bloodborne/HazMat training is unnecessary. Training time and money could be spent on other topics.
12	Law Enforcement Refresher. Defensive Driving. Criminal Law and Procedure.
13	Difficult for small departments to fulfill training requirements due to manpower and financial issues.
14	<p>Training for smaller agencies should be held throughout the state and at reduced rates, otherwise the burden is too much.</p> <p>(Question 4/4a: Limited; no set amount.)</p>
15	<p>If state mandated in-service training standards were required to attain a certain level of accepted proficiency, I think it would go a long way in reducing lawsuits in these areas. Record keeping could also be more consistent.</p> <p>Re question 10: Even after serving over 40 years in law enforcement, I am still unable to perceive the field of law enforcement as a true profession. At least, not when it is measured against other recognized professions that require a certain level of education and/or training. And, I have always thought that this observation had a lot to do with the fact that there has never been a state mandated standard of achievement to attain this standard. A status that should be available to every police officer through basic training, formal education, on the job experience, in-service training and even testing, if necessary. I envision that a program of this nature could result in Michigan having one of the most professionalized police forces in the country. Therefore, my suggestion would be to use some of the grant money to create a study, at least to explore the idea.</p>
16	Re question 10: Any additional training is an asset.
17	Re question 10: We are not allotted grant funds at this time.
18	There must be mandatory annual training specific to the level (rank) of each officer. This will provide a subjective evaluation file at MCOLES to assist in agency evaluations and as an available adjunct in the hiring process of experienced officers.

-
- 19 I think the State of Michigan should require 40 hours of in-service training each year per officer on the above subjects. This would do two things: (1) it would help Dept. head to get money from the City Council for training, (2) reduce claims to be paid on lawsuits because officer would have to receive x numbers of training per year to continue to be certified.
- (For question 5: in-service budget -\$600 for training and \$8400 for wages.)
-
- 20 Publishing statewide list of certified instructors of required MCOLES training officers.
-
- 21 Standards are necessary and great to have, but small departments have limited budgets both for training and to maintain patrol coverage. We have never had a failure to train lawsuit, but that is always a possibility. In-service training must be done frequently enough that small departments do not necessarily have to shut down (unless they are very small departments). Where possible agencies (such as city and county) should band together and pool their expertise, making reliance on outside training to be less necessary.
-
- 22 Small police departments don't have the funds for training - therefore we have to pick cheap or free training. Also, the officer away from duties causes the question - pay someone to cover or rely on sheriff or MSP?
-
- 23 Although MSP offers training courses, they often pack them with troopers leaving little or no space for outside agencies.
-
- 24 RADAR certification as a mandatory course in an academy would be very useful.
-
- 25 I wouldn't get bogged down on the discussions about paying for OT to cover officers who are at training. The respective agencies should plan for that. Regional training sites would help lessen load for travel and expenses.
-
- 26 Need to have additional programs for Southwest Michigan closer to Michigan.
-
- 27 Small town departments need help. Sending officers to eastside of state is not cost effective. I don't mind paying overtime for training, but it adds up.
-
- 28 Re question 10: Week-long advanced officer training would cover all yearly officer certifications.
-
- 29 I feel that in service training should be mandatory (sic).
-
- 30 Consortium status may change; Delta is coming up with a new plan.
-
- 31 I think In-service training should consist of required topics such as above. This should be mandated by MCOLES for a set number of hours every year. Currently, some departments only qualify with weapons once per year and some 2-3 times.
-
- 32 We have had our own Clinton County Core Training for several years. This has helped all agencies in the county to update their training. And large saving training funds, because we use our own trainers.
-
- 33 I do agree that something has to be done about training. So many older officers have not been to training causing liabilities. The amounts of required training could be handled. The amount to be determined is not sure, but to start the program at least 24 hours per year could be worked out.

Re question 4b: More training is needed for each officer but due to manpower/money this is hard to do for a small agency.

-
- 34 I feel agencies, large or small, have fallen into that mode of not making training available for an officer's specific needs, I.e. legal updates, first aid, community policing, etc. Failure to recognize and address an officer's needs make the issues of liability more prevalent.
 - 35 Training updates can and should be considered at regional training academies throughout the state. This can be done inbetween cadet training.
 - 36 Re question 10: Smaller departments have a hard time getting funds. The paperwork is too confusing and time consuming. More money should be able for equipment purchases.
-

11-29

-
- 1 The present problem we deal with is man/women power to cover shifts while other officers are at training. Currently we need to remove detectives from the DB and cover road spots or run the shift with 1 sgt. And 2 patrol officer, our city population of 25000, that's short!! Shifts could be filled with OT money provided by MCOLES.
 - 2 There should be more training in the area of liability issues (firearms, pursuits, etc.).
 - 3 Officer instructor courses (train the trainer) so that agencies can provide training within agency for less cost.
 - 4 There is a great need by small communities to train their officers with the very latest equipment, info. Most cannot send their officers like well-to-do cities. There should be a minimum amount of training hours or CE "continuing education" credits - each officer should attend each year, say 20-25 hours, credits, etc.
 - 5 Any standard you create will have to be met by the mid-size to small agencies. Training creates manpower issues that must be covered by overtime, unless done during shift hours!
 - 6 I believe that the commission should focus significant attention on issues related to improved customer service. Emphasize ethics and professional conduct issues. Transfer some attention away from procedures to emphasis on excellent results (goals, missions).
 - 7 Re question 8: Note- this department opposes mandatory "core" training.
 - 8
 - 1. If MCOLES establishes training standards, there must be sufficient funds to train all officers in Michigan to those standards, I.e. no unfunded mandates.
 - 2. If MCOLES establishes training standards all departments must train to those standards or face an increased liability exposure. This may revert to the individual officer.
 - 9 I believe people should be screened and evaluated prior to being allowed to attend any academy for law enforcement training. I have interviewed countless applicants who are certifiable, but should never be police officers!

Re question 3: too much \$ for what they offer.
 - 10 The Commission should accept any training which is approved by another state's training commission. Agencies along the Indiana state line can train officers much cheaper in Indiana at their approved courses than in MI. Any other state's approved training should be good enough to qualify in MI.
 - 11 MCOLES could get the right chief's position updated for their records.
 - 12 Would like to objective standard to relieve tort liability.
 - 13 It is important that any licensed profession have some type of continuing ed process. I also believe many LE problems come about as a result of failing to train.

-
- 14 Establish a "core curriculum" (firearms, first aid, defensive tactics, etc.) that is necessary to maintain certification. This will have to be "leveled" based on assignment. Certification of existing departmental programs to MCOLES standards and develop the "advanced" or "specialized" classes or instructors.
-
- 15 Only comment I have is all our incident reports are entered on computers Is anyone teaching typing? Not that I can see.
- Re question 9: Through the training council (Muskegon) we schedule what training is necessary on an annual basis.
-
- 16 On staff training/instructors need to be recognized and accepted as qualified - provided that their training as instructors is acceptable to MCOLES.
-
- 17 The (--) Police Department supports the concept of mandatory training.
-
- 18 Make training mandatory for in-service officers!
-
- 19 We need a firearms standard.
-
- 20 There should be standards regarding such issues as pursuit driving and firearms training.
-
- 21 A standardized level would benefit every department in the possible lower rates on liability insurance and in turn lawsuits.
- Re question 4a: listed 1452 hours per officer.
-
- 22 Should be given in one block 3-4 days. This assists in scheduling for both large and small agencies.
-
- 23 If MCOLES mandates continuing education credits for in-service personnel the tracking of this should be the responsibility of MCOLES, not the agency or officer.
-
- 24 Need to have police officers licensed (like nurse). Mandatory in-service training.
-
- 25 Use of force, arrest procedure, etc., are very important. At this time we are presently in Federal court in a lawsuit that specifically addresses these issues. We believe that we will win, but I know many departments that have no policies nor do any training in these critical areas.
- Re question 4a: 26 hrs. department required. Up to 40 hrs. by contract.
- Re question 5: We need more 302 funding. Raise the \$5.00 training surcharge.
-
- 26 For small departments, this standard could be difficult. We can only train a small number of officers at a time and getting all sworn officers trained in a reasonable time would be difficult. The replacement cost would also be difficult for us.
-

30-99

-
- 1 If standards continue to be raised, as I believe they should, more raining should be offered in the state. For instance, EVOC should be offered at least quarterly to accommodate all personnel on a regular basis.
- Re question 10: An attempt should be made that the subject or focus of the grant is applicable to the (??) applying. Perhaps the financial need should also be considered.
-
- 2 The need for some sort of physical agility training would help protect officers as well as municipalities, i.e. less prone to injury.
-

-
- 3 Listed 459 hours of training during 2001.
-
- 4 Consider adopting mandatory retraining for officers after graduation from police academy 6 months, 2 years, 5 years.
- Re question 10: To work in conjunction with regional training facilities to lower cost, increase frequency of training availability.
-
- 5 I visualize regional centers for training of all law enforcement from basic to advanced to specialists. These academies would follow the same standards and curriculum. While we have not had lawsuits on failure to train, I am always concerned about racial profiling matters.
- Re question 4a, includes LE and medical.
-
- 6 I think there should be at least a 40 hour yearly requirement for in-service for all police officers. The topics should be selected from those that expose us to the most liability.
-
- 7 We have not experienced any failure to train suits. Training requirements should relate to officers duties or assignments (i.e. detective vs. road patrol). The timeframe for completion of core program must be realistic. We must consider staffing issues while officers are out on training assignments.
-
- 8 There should be a stricter standard for approved classes. The subject material should be relevant and the student should be able to use what is taught. More hands on type training and there should be a pass/fail rating.
-
- 9 I support in-service training standards and don't feel our department will have any problem meeting them. Our consortium [Flint] is excellent to deal with and very responsive to training ideas. We have had two fail to train issues that prompted us to reevaluate those areas.
- (Question 4b: refresher is 3-day comprehensive session. We prefer officers go through this every 3-5 years.)
-
- 10 In my experience as a law enforcement executive and as a private consultant, I recommend that you contact the major insurance carriers in the state (for example, MMRMA, MML and others, the Detroit Police Department as they are self-insured) relative to the number of lawsuits filed against them for failure to train. I would suggest that as well as getting statistics on the lawsuits where departments/cities have had to pay, it would be equally important to have the statistics on the lawsuits where the charges or allegations were dismissed or the Court found "no cause of action." I submit that a compilation of these types of statistics would certainly reflect the areas state-wide where law enforcement needs to do more training.
-
- 11 Remember Headlee - don't mandate what you can't pay for. Grants are not sufficient.
-
- 12 Re question 4a: 16 hours is contractual; average is 40 +.
-
- 13 In-service training does work well within a police agency. If we are going to be required to train for a certain number of hours per year, how do I set aside the time and money for training. It is already difficult enough at times dealing with manpower issues and money for the resources.
-

100-200

- 1 Question 10: Regional training on special topics, such as terrorism awareness, especially training that develops instructors that can go back to their department and teach others.

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 2 | Current training officers should be used to develop the required in-service training standards; not the department administrators. Training should be continually updated. |
| 3 | Inservice training in the basics is important and so is additional funding from state and federal government. Don't mandate something without adequate funds to support it. |
| 4 | MCOLES - Thank you for asking.

Training in reducing civil exposure "do's and don'ts" in prep for and after a major, potentially civil, incident.

(Question 4c: register courses - not normally, contractor presentations are sometimes approved.) |
| 5 | Implement regional training blocks for hot key topics.

Mandatory minimum training requirements for all agencies. |
-

Other

1-10

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | There must be room in any training program to provide agency identified training needs.

Re question 1: Park law enforcement. |
| 2 | Re question 1: Railroad police. |
| 3 | Re question 1: Tribal police. |
-

11-29

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | I believe that it is essential for MCOLES to implement at least a 40 hour in-service training requirement. A lot of departments don't do any in-service training and it shows. I have our mandatory training each year and then I encourage my officers to attend as much training as we can afford. Training reduces stress and makes a more effective and efficient police department.

Re question 1: Tribal |
| 2 | Re question 1: Tribal agency. |
| 3 | Re question 1: Tribal Police |
-

30-99

-
- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1 | Re question 1: Tribal |
|---|-----------------------|
-

Sheriff

1-10

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Nothing other than most training is held down state. We on the west end of the UP spend more time traveling than in sessions. |
|---|---|
-

11-29

-
- 1 Attainable training that does not tie the hands of small agencies with short staffing levels. A work as you go interactive web based project could solve scheduling for traditional classroom type training. Affordable, concise, necessary items only please.
 - 2 ALERT = Advanced Law Enforcement Refresher Training
 - 3 Re question 4: firearms only required; other not mandated.
 - 4 Are Michigan law enforcement officers required to attend specific training annually to retain their certification? If so, what are the areas/courses they MUST attend?
 - 5 Provide more money for the mandatory training.
 - 6 I believe to keep a high level of professionalism within the law enforcement community, in-service training must be mandated or it will not occur in most departments.
 - 7 With technologies today - we should be putting efforts towards developing DVD-CD ROM interactive computer based training which could be done in-house saving many training dollars which are spent on replacement - travel etc. to departments.
 - 8 Question 10: need consideration for smaller agencies with limited budgets. Rural remote areas limited to available training.
 - 9 Report Writting!! (sic)
 - 10 Don't set the bar to (sic) high!
 - 11 State mandated training should include state funding for such requirements.
- Re question 10: "In-service" training funds made available to smaller training consortiums and departments. Funding always "trickles down" to the smaller agencies after large departments obtain theirs.
-

30-99

-
- 1 The standards are very applicable. Now that MCOLES is being organized it will make the records of accountability available, which may eliminate those type of lawsuits.
 - 2 I believe that there should be an in-service training requirement. A standard would force local governments to provide funding. Would like to see a requirement for driving skills.
 - 3 Smaller agencies have minimal resources (funding) to provide in-service training. Regional sites and minimal or no fee training opportunities will make training opportunities much more accessible to small departments.
 - 4 Would like to see mandated standards for in-service training requirements along with how to pay for them. (Road coverage during training, due to lack of overtime funds available).
 - 5 The basis for developing in-service training standards should be the basic knowledge skills and abilities required of all law enforcement officers as outlined in their job descriptions. Training should focus on these basic skills required to perform their day-to-day responsibilities.
-

100-200

-
- 1 All officers should be involved in reality based simunitions training. Further, there is a great need for pursuit driving training and the facilities to train that issue.
 - 2 We have not been successfully sued for failure to train.
-

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| 3 | Mandatory in-service training requirements must provide funding for courses and/or overtime funding. Agencies will not have funds available for additional overtime. |
| 4 | Need to focus on the basics when making requirements or standards across the board. |
-

We have no experience with failure to train lawsuits.

State

11-29

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | In-service should be offered regional concept. A portion of 302 dollars should be given to MCOLES they conduct core course training regionally at no cost. Current consortium cost too much for the little training they provide. |
| 2 | Training should focus on areas of low probability/high liability & prioritize such a list. The things our officers are faced with in this arena are shootings, vehicle chases, etc. |
-

30-99

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | MSP Post. Training requirements set by training academy. |
|---|--|
-

201+

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | I have no experience with civil lawsuits on fail to train. Standard training throughout the state would help our profession. Conflicts still continue on what or who provides the best training. MCOLES should continue with their accreditation of training to maintain an acceptable standard. |
| 2 | Conflict resolution is an often overlooked activity provided by L.E. For example many young officers are routinely investigating domestic incidents and they themselves have never been married or long term relationship. |
| 3 | Consistency of objectives, instructor skills, program quality needs to occur. Law quality or improper/outdated instruction opens up liabilities as failure to train. |
| 4 | MSP does quite well in this regard. |
| 5 | There should be physical fitness standards for in-service officers, graduated by age. |
-

Re question 10: DNR not eligible for rant monies. However, we work OUIL patrols as much as other agencies. We would like information on how to become eligible for these funds.

Township

1-10

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | The more inservice training any officer can receive in any of law enforcement will further enable to have the officer speak with confidence and act with surety in any court/civil trial that may be encountered. |
| 2 | I have had no experience here [presumably to the example of lawsuits]. I do believe wholeheartedly in the value of quality training especially in our fast changing world. |
| 3 | Training offered at central location and available to all departments . Possibly at state academy to offer core yearly courses and updates on a regular basis. |

-
- | | |
|----|---|
| 4 | I believe it's long overdue that at least a minimal hours will be required in the above mentioned areas. If the state requires this training it may be easier to get more money budgeted to training. Knock on wood, we have not been involved in this type of court situation yet. |
| | Re question 4b: We use a block training through NMU Regional Academy for most of these courses. |
| 5 | Very important - needs to be required. |
| 6 | Training should be a local issue pertaining to that community (as should hiring) and not state mandated. You could train all the time and not work and still get sued. |
| | Re question 10: Training for new hires - the bulk of the money is used to get an officer started or up to speed - many new officers start off in small departments which lose money for 302 training in between each new officer. |
| 7 | I would like to see a general requirement where we as chiefs can still tailor our department's choices of classes to our individual needs. I would like to stress legal updates as well as the psychology type classes. I think these are more important than PPCT, driver training (recert) and building search classes. |
| 8 | Re question 10: We get \$500 per year in 302 funds. Would like to see this go up to \$1000. (Small agency: 1-10) |
| 9 | Fair, equal funded. |
| 10 | I would like to see a mandatory hours of training per year, i.e. 30 hours, however, training must be accessible to the officers. |
| 11 | Would like to see the local community colleges with police academy become regional in-service areas that would offer core training. |
| 12 | MCOLES and CJIS should not require anything they cannot totally fund. You will run smaller agencies into closing their doors. |
-

11-29

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Administration must train in house in three areas: lethal force plus range; 2 non-lethal force - defensive tactics; 3. Vehicle pursuit methods and incorporate policy with philosophy of agency. |
| 2 | I feel that the training of in-service officers is only limited by budgets, the standards are fine, some departments' budgets are the problem. |
| 3 | (Question 4b: Miscellaneous - Nobody gets it all due to scheduling problems.) |
| 4 | Looking forward to MCOLES moving toward some in-service standard of training (curriculum and/or hours) for continuing education minimums for certification. Some agencies will only train P.O.s/LEOs with "minimums" in mind. |
| 5 | Re question 3: just left Flint academy |
| 6 | Since I teach firearms at the (--) academy, I believe we should pursue simunitions type (more reality based) firearms training. |
-

30-99

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| 1 | Although officers are certified in instruction of topics, no minimum or standard requirements are set. When instructors are trained, they should be given required minimum expectations to implement. This would allow agencies to rely upon an agreed standard when brought to court. |
| <hr/> | |
| 2 | Any inservice training standards that MCOLES is considering should not focus on the minimum required but actual need based on surveys of 20+ personnel agencies. |
| <p>Re question 8: Driving and accidents are our highest liability issues but it is the least available outside source or LEORTC provided training.</p> | |
| <hr/> | |
| 3 | I would like to see MCOLES require in-service training. These requirements should be phased in over a 3 year period. |
| <hr/> | |
| 4 | Mandatory inservice training is needed. The issue is political and budgetary. |
| <hr/> | |
| 5 | Continue the pre-employment physical agility test. |
-

POST Survey Results: States with In-Service Training Mandate

Yes Arizona

Determined by agency and approved by the Board.

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Technical Studies	4
-------------------	---

California	24 hours per 2 years
------------	----------------------

14 of the 24 hours must be in the perishable skills training.

Florida	40 hours per 4 years
---------	----------------------

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Annual Firearms Qualification	
-------------------------------	--

Indiana	16 hours per year
---------	-------------------

All other mandated topics are on abuse/domestic violence - some training each year. Hazardous Materials - OSHA, Haz-Mat requirements. Bloodborne pathogens - OSHA requirements.

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Arrest and Control	4
--------------------	---

Kansas	40 hours per 1 year
--------	---------------------

None mandated.

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Use of Force	
--------------	--

Kentucky	40 hours per 1 year
----------	---------------------

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Firearms	
----------	--

Maryland	18 hours per 1 year
----------	---------------------

We only require that training be job related. The Commission does occasionally recommend training on a certain topic.

Minnesota	48 hours per 3 years
-----------	----------------------

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Mental Health	1
---------------	---

Missouri	48 hours per 3 years
----------	----------------------

Additional 32 hours in any of the above-listed curricula areas.

<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>
----------------------	---------------------

Emergency Vehicle Operations/Pursuit Driving	
---	--

New Hampshire	8 hours per 1 year	Discretion of employing agency. Cannot use defensive tactics, firearms, or first aid/CPR recertification to meet this standard.				
New Mexico	40 hours per 2 years	Varies by board mandate every 2 years: 8 of 40 hours.				
		<table><tr><td><i>Course</i></td><td><i>Hours</i></td></tr><tr><td>Legal Studies</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>	Legal Studies	4
<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>					
Legal Studies	4					
North Carolina		Every LEO must qualify with his/her handgun a minimum of once per year. Though hours are not set, the officer must qualify in a manner consistent with BLET, and the agency must cover Use of Force, Safety, and Review of Basic Marksmanship Fundamentals.				
		<table><tr><td><i>Course</i></td><td><i>Hours</i></td></tr><tr><td>Tactical or Interpersonal Communications</td><td>2</td></tr></table>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>	Tactical or Interpersonal Communications	2
<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>					
Tactical or Interpersonal Communications	2					
North Dakota	60 hours per 3 years					
		<table><tr><td><i>Course</i></td><td><i>Hours</i></td></tr><tr><td>Career Development</td><td>36</td></tr></table>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>	Career Development	36
<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>					
Career Development	36					
Oklahoma	16 hours per 1 year					
		<table><tr><td><i>Course</i></td><td><i>Hours</i></td></tr><tr><td>SIDS</td><td>2</td></tr></table>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>	SIDS	2
<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>					
SIDS	2					
Texas	40 hours per 2 years	Family violence, child abuse, sexual assault, sex offender characteristics, and cultural diversity every four years, no more than 20 hours for all. There is a one-time requirement for 4 hours on racial profiling and 2 hours on asset forfeiture.				
Utah	40 hours per year	Provided in in-service book.				
		<table><tr><td><i>Course</i></td><td><i>Hours</i></td></tr><tr><td>Legal</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>	Legal	4
<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>					
Legal	4					
Vermont	25 hours per year	25 hours per year for full-time; 30 hours per year for part-time. Firearms and first aid, no specific hours.				
		<table><tr><td><i>Course</i></td><td><i>Hours</i></td></tr><tr><td>Annual Firearms Qualificatoin</td><td></td></tr></table>	<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>	Annual Firearms Qualificatoin	
<i>Course</i>	<i>Hours</i>					
Annual Firearms Qualificatoin						
Virginia	40 hours per Every other calendar year.					

Wisconsin	24 hours per year	There are no mandatory subjects for in-service training with the exception that each officer must receive at least 4 hours of training related to vehicular pursuits driving each biennium.				
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>First Aid</td><td></td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	First Aid	
Course	Hours					
First Aid						
Wyoming	40 hours per 2 years	Mandate only states that it must be job related.				
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>Human Diversity</td><td>8</td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	Human Diversity	8
Course	Hours					
Human Diversity	8					
No Alaska						
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>Interpersonal Studies</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	Interpersonal Studies	4
Course	Hours					
Interpersonal Studies	4					
Arkansas						
District of Columbia						
Idaho						
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>Professional Traffic Stops</td><td></td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	Professional Traffic Stops	
Course	Hours					
Professional Traffic Stops						
Michigan						
Nebraska		In the process of implementing standards modeled after Kansas.				
New York						
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>Tactical Firearms or Force Option Simulator</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	Tactical Firearms or Force Option Simulator	4
Course	Hours					
Tactical Firearms or Force Option Simulator	4					
Ohio		The only requirement is yearly requalification with every firearm used.				
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>Domestic Violence</td><td></td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	Domestic Violence	
Course	Hours					
Domestic Violence						
Oregon		Proposed 84 hours every three years. Eight hours annual firearms/use of force; remainder general law enforcement.				
		<table><tr><th>Course</th><th>Hours</th></tr><tr><td>Drivers Training Awareness</td><td>4</td></tr></table>	Course	Hours	Drivers Training Awareness	4
Course	Hours					
Drivers Training Awareness	4					
Washington						

POST Survey Results: Differing In-Service Requirements and Methods of Compliance

States with Different Requirements for Managers/Executives

<i>State</i>	<i>Comments:</i>
California	The Continued Professional Training (CPT) requirement of 14 hours perishable skills is not required of managers.
Maryland	Officers at the first line supervisor or below need annual in-service training. All must have annual firearms.
Oregon	Proposed 8 hour annual leadership/professional training; remainder general law enforcement training.
Texas	Chiefs of police have a special chief's course. First time supervisors are supposed to have a 20 hour supervision course.
Virginia	Hours are the same. Management chooses the training for the officers and themselves.

States with Different Requirements for Special Functions Officers

<i>State</i>	<i>Comments:</i>
Indiana	They are not mandated to complete the 16 hour in-service training, but they may do so if they wish.
Utah	Special Functions Officer (SFO) - five weeks vs. Law Enforcement Officer (LEO) - 14 weeks.
Vermont	5 more hours if in-service; no topics except firearms and first aid required.
Wyoming	Reserves or part-time require same basic training but only 20 hours every two years for recertification.

***States Allowing Computer or College Courses to Satisfy
In-Service Training Mandates***

***Computer
Courses***

State

Yes

Arizona
California
Florida
Kansas
Maryland
Minnesota
Missouri
New Hampshire
New Mexico
North Dakota
Oklahoma
Oregon
Texas
Vermont
Wisconsin
Wyoming

No

Alaska
Arkansas
District of Columbia
Idaho
Indiana
Kentucky
Michigan
Nebraska
New York
North Carolina
Ohio
Utah
Virginia
Washington

***College
Courses***

State

Yes

Alaska
Florida
Kansas
Maryland
Minnesota
Missouri
New Mexico
Oregon
Vermont
Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

No

Arizona
Arkansas
California
District of Columbia
Idaho
Indiana
Kentucky
Michigan
Nebraska
New Hampshire
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Texas
Utah
Washington

POST Survey Results: In-Service Training Mandate Funding Sources

<i>State</i>	<i>Agency Responsible</i>	<i>Officer Responsible</i>	<i>General Fund</i>	<i>Special Assmt.</i>	<i>Restricted Fund</i>	<i>Traffic Enf.</i>	<i>Criminal Conviction</i>	<i>Other:</i>
<i>Alaska</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Arizona</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Arkansas</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>California</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>District of Columbia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Florida</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Idaho</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Indiana</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Kansas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Kentucky</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Maryland</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Michigan</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Minnesota</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Missouri</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Nebraska</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New Hampshire</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New Mexico</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>New York</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>North Carolina</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>North Dakota</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Ohio</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<i>Oklahoma</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Oregon</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Texas</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Utah</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Vermont</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Virginia</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Washington</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Wisconsin</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Wyoming</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Totals:</i>	<i>Agency Responsible</i>	<i>Officer Responsible</i>	<i>General Fund</i>	<i>Special Assmt.</i>	<i>Restricted Fund</i>	<i>Traffic Enf.</i>	<i>Criminal Conviction</i>	<i>Other:</i>
	<i>10</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>0</i>

Special Assessment Revenue Sources

<i>State</i>	<i>Special Assessment Source</i>
Alaska	Surcharge: \$10 per citation, \$75 per DWI, \$50 for misdemeanors, and \$100 for felonies.
Arizona	15% surcharge on traffic and criminal fines.
California	Penalty Assessment Fund from fines and forfeitures.
Florida	Chapter 318.21.
Kentucky	1.5% surcharge on insurance premiums.
Maryland	Maryland has a special assessment but it is used to build a public safety training center and operations. We do offer some in-service at minimal cost.
Minnesota	\$25 added to certain traffic and criminal offenses.
Missouri	\$1 added to every ticket or fine is placed in the POST training fund and is dispensed annually.
Texas	\$6 million is distributed directly to each agency. See Sec 1701.157.
Utah	As of July 1, 2002, 100% of our funding will come from special assessment: 24% from felony fine, 76% from DUI and traffic. We receive 18.5% from the surcharge which goes to our budget.
Vermont	\$2 added to all traffic fines.
Virginia	\$1.00 on convictions.

Wisconsin

Penalty Assessments revenue supports the Law Enforcement Training Fund which the Dept. of Justice employs to reimburse state and local agencies for basic, in-service and specialized training. Of the 24% penalty assessment rate, 1/2 is LETF - \$6.5 million

POST Survey Results: In-Service Mandate Reporting and Penalties

<i>State</i>	<i>In-Service Training Reported to the Commission/POST by:</i>
Alaska	Form submitted by instructor.
Arizona	Agencies are responsible for maintaining training records and ensuring that programs have been approved. POST audits agency training records.
Florida	Via employing agency or Commission-certified training center.
Indiana	Each department must submit an annual training report.
Kansas	By provided form or via internet-based reporting.
Kentucky	Paper forms.
Maryland	It is reported in electronic format compatible with the Commission's D/P system or on scan sheets we distribute. We don't accept written scores.
Michigan	Rosters submitted per course by course instructor.
Minnesota	All approved training is submitted to POST by roster. POST logs all credits. Individuals who attend classes or conferences on their own may apply for individual credit.
Missouri	An affidavit is submitted by the CEO of a law enforcement agency.
New Hampshire	Annual form signed by CEO under penalty of unsworn falsification.
New Mexico	Negative reporting at this time - officers not in compliance to be reported by agency. Going to positive reporting in 12-18 months.
North Carolina	Agency head submits one page form at the end of the calendar year which lists all officers who failed to qualify between January 1 and December 31.
North Dakota	By agency, individual or instructor.
Oklahoma	By the agency.
Texas	Via training academy, training contractor, or internet.
Utah	Each individual agency.
Vermont	Once a year (March 1) in writing. We will be going to computerized program next year.
Virginia	By the certified training academy in which the agency has membership.
Wisconsin	Training records are maintained by law enforcement agencies which, in turn, report training results to the Department of Justice.
Wyoming	Through our certification process and by certificates of completion and college transcripts.

<i><u>State</u></i>	<i><u>Penalty for Non-compliance with In-Service Mandate:</u></i>
Arizona	Officer's certification is suspended until training is completed.
California	The agency is required to maintain the regulatory requirement. Compliance checks are performed. Agency may be removed from the POST program.
Florida	Certificate goes to inactive status until 40 hours of mandatory retraining is obtained.
Indiana	The officer is not eligible for continued employment. To regain eligibility, the officer must make up the training hours deficit.
Kansas	Certification subject to revocation, suspension, or censure.
Kentucky	Loss of certification which results in loss of \$3,100 yearly stipend.
Maryland	The firearms must be removed on 1/1 if no annual firearms training. If an officer misses training, certification will not be renewed, and the officer can't enforce criminal laws.
Minnesota	License expires once three-year period has elapsed.
Missouri	License can be revoked, suspended or placed on probation.
New Hampshire	Decertification of officers and if agency is at fault, decertification of their CEO.
New Mexico	Decertification
North Carolina	Failure to qualify will result in a Summary Suspension of certification; a suspended officer must complete the 48 hour firearms block of instruction in BLET and qualify in order to have certification reinstated.
North Dakota	Non-renewal of license.
Oklahoma	Suspension of Certification
Oregon	Proposed recall of certification until training completed.
Texas	The officer's license will automatically expire. We have in the past suspended licenses for 90 days.
Utah	Loss of certification.
Vermont	Technically, certification is lost. There are loopholes for this.
Virginia	Forfeiture of office and all pay and allowances shall cease.
Wisconsin	Decertification
Wyoming	We do not recertify.

POST Survey Results: Mandated Curriculum Development and Presentation

<i>State</i>	<i>Commission/ POST</i>	<i>Instructor Agency</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Comments:</i>	<i>Instructor Must be Certified</i>
Alaska	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Arizona	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Arkansas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
California	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
District of Columbia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Florida	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Idaho	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indiana	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academy staff; some department input.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Kansas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kentucky	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Maryland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Michigan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minnesota	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Missouri	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Subject matter experts at training centers.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Nebraska	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Hampshire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Mexico	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New York	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
North Carolina	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
North Dakota	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ohio	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oklahoma	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Oregon	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Texas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utah	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vermont	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Virginia	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified Academy primarily.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Washington	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wisconsin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Wyoming	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Total</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>15</i>

Appendix H:
Carry Concealed Weapon Issues

Agency Survey Results: CCW Materials Provided by MCOLES

Agencies Reporting that Materials had been Reviewed

<i>Reviewed MCOLES</i>		<i>Agency Size</i>					
<i>Materials</i>	<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
Yes	College/University	4	6	3			13
	Municipal	73	50	19	9	2	153
	Other	3	3	1			7
	Sheriff	3	21	9	7	1	41
	State	1	6	3		10	20
	Township	19	12	7			38
	<i>Total</i>	103	98	42	16	13	272
No	Municipal	17	7	8	1		33
	Sheriff		3	1			4
	State		2	1			3
	Township	5	4	3			12
	<i>Total</i>	22	16	13	1		52

Reported Usefulness of MCOLES CCW Training Materials

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>Usefulness of Material</i>	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	<i>Total</i>
College/University	Very Useful	1	3	1			5
	Somewhat Useful	3	3	2			8
Municipal	Very Useful	34	21	10	4		69
	Somewhat Useful	38	27	9	5	2	81
	Not Very Useful	1	2				3
Other	Very Useful	3	2	1			6
	Somewhat Useful		1				1
Sheriff	Very Useful	2	7	5	3		17
	Somewhat Useful	1	13	4	4	1	23
	Not Very Useful		1				1
State	Very Useful		3			4	7
	Somewhat Useful	1	3	3		6	13
Township	Very Useful	9	3	2			14
	Somewhat Useful	10	8	4			22
	Not Very Useful		1	1			2

Agency Survey Results: CCW Encounters/Arrests

Agencies Reporting an Increase in CCW Encounters since July 1, 2000

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>Agency Size</i>					<i>Total</i>
	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	
Municipal	8	6	7	2		23
Sheriff		4	3			7
State		3	2		4	9
Township	7	2	1			10
<i>Total</i>	15	15	13	2	4	49

Agencies Reporting Specific Problems on CCW Encounters

<i>Agency Type</i>	<i>Agency Size</i>					<i>Total</i>
	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	
Municipal	1	2	3			6
Sheriff		3				3
State		1	1		2	4
Township		2	1			3
<i>Total</i>	1	8	5		2	16

Problems Reported on CCW Encounters

- 1 College CJ graduate carrying loaded pistol around in vehicle while submitting CCW license application (had application in his vehicle thinking it ok to carry pistol).

- 2 Subject did not disclose that he had a CCW permit because he stated he did not have firearm with him. Officer has no way of knowing if that is true unless subject gives consent to search or other probable cause factors.

- 3 Gun seen in bank and mall - police called by alarm company. Officers see gun that has not yet been called to the officer's attention by the CCW permit holder. Officers question what to do with the gun while they carry out a preliminary investigation/interview.

- 4 Fail to identify as CCW holder.

- 5 Advising officer that they have a CCW permit.

-
- 6 Info put out by state is confusing at best.
-
- 7 Questions arise, but only during discussion. Nothing during routine contacts on the street.
-
- 8 The permit was poorly assembled, giving an unprofessional appearance.
-
- 9 People are still forgetting to advise officers of the presence of a firearm in the vehicle.
-
- 10 Failure to ID immediately in possession of CCW.
-
- 11 The issue of auxiliary officers with CCW permits entering pistol free zones still needs to be resolved.
-
- 12 Problems with reserve officers carrying. Residents who do not know the laws and carry in prohibited areas.
-
- 13 The CCW law in many areas is vague, lacks specific standards, and in many cases law enforcement agencies cannot get a straight answer to our questions from anyone. The entire law needs to be revised and changes, corrections and amendments must be made.
-
- 14 Timely disclosure of CCW permit during LE contact needs to be addressed.
-
- 15 CCW violation, brandishing weapon, permit holder.
-
- 16 Several cases of fail to disclose had permit. Several that had misdemeanor arrests and applied.
-
- 17 In consideration of traffic through casino, no noticeable increase or problems.
-
- 18 The question has come up about - do we take possession of the weapon during stop, then return after stop is completed? Or leave where it is?
-
- 19 It seems to be a non-issue so far. Obviously that can change with time.
-
- 20 Complex new law - law enforcement does not totally understand yet.
-
- 21 Courts in another county ruling occupant does not need to inform officer of CCW permit at beginning of stop.
-
- 22 LEIN did not show a CCW permit. The subject showed a permit which was verified through the issuing county and the state.
-
- 23 We are giving permits to people who are too old and stupid to be carrying guns. I cannot believe these people ever passed a class.
-

Agencies Reporting Arrests for CCW Violations

<i>AgencyType</i>	<i>Agency Size</i>					<i>Total</i>
	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	
Municipal	4	3	10	4	1	22
Sheriff		3	4	1	1	9
State		4	4		5	13
Township		3	2			5
<i>Total</i>	4	13	20	5	7	49

Agency Survey Report: Separation of CCW Permit-Holders from Weapons

Agencies Reporting a Policy or Custom to Separate Permit Holders from Weapons

<i>AgencyType</i>	<i>Agency Size</i>					<i>Total</i>
	<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	
Municipal	14	9	7	4		34
Other		2	1			3
Sheriff		2	3	1	1	7
State	1	4	1		1	7
Township	2	2	4			8
<i>Total</i>	17	19	16	5	2	59

Conditions Where Officers Take Control of Weapon

<i>AgencyType</i>	<i>Control for</i>	<i>Agency Size</i>					<i>Total</i>
		<i>1-10</i>	<i>11-29</i>	<i>30-99</i>	<i>100-200</i>	<i>201+</i>	
College/University	Reasonable Suspicion Only		1				1
Municipal	Reasonable Suspicion Only	29	19	10	4		62
	All CCW Encounters	6	1	3	2		12
Other	Reasonable Suspicion Only	2	3	1			6
	All CCW Encounters	1					1
Sheriff	Reasonable Suspicion Only		2	3	1	1	7
	All CCW Encounters		2				2
State	Reasonable Suspicion Only		5	1		6	12
	All CCW Encounters	1					1
Township	Reasonable Suspicion Only	4	3	4			11
	All CCW Encounters	1	1	1			3
<i>Total</i>		44	37	23	7	7	118

Note: A number of agencies reporting conditions where officers take control of weapons did not report an agency policy or custom to do so.

Agency Survey Results: Additional CCW Training

Training Reported as Beneficial

<i>Agency Type</i> <i>Number of Officers</i>	<i>Additional</i> <i>Videos</i>	<i>Regional</i> <i>Training</i>	<i>Tele-</i> <i>Conferences</i>	<i>Written</i> <i>Materials</i>	<i>Instructor</i> <i>Training</i>	<i>Other</i> <i>Training</i>
College/University						
<i>1-10</i>	3	2	0	2	2	0
<i>11-29</i>	5	3	0	1	2	0
<i>30-99</i>	2	1	0	2	0	1
<i>Total:</i>	10	6	0	5	4	1
Municipal						
<i>1-10</i>	53	36	2	39	27	3
<i>11-29</i>	29	18	1	29	26	3
<i>30-99</i>	16	5	1	16	18	0
<i>100-200</i>	6	4	0	6	4	0
<i>201+</i>	2	0	0	2	0	0
<i>Total:</i>	106	63	4	92	75	6
Other						
<i>1-10</i>	2	0	0	3	1	0
<i>11-29</i>	2	0	0	0	2	0
<i>30-99</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Total:</i>	4	1	0	3	3	0
Sheriff						
<i>1-10</i>	1	2	0	1	2	0
<i>11-29</i>	9	5	0	9	7	2
<i>30-99</i>	7	2	0	2	2	1
<i>100-200</i>	3	1	0	5	1	0

<i>201+</i>	1	0	0	1	1	0
<i>Total:</i>	21	10	0	18	13	3
State						
<i>1-10</i>	1	1	0	1	1	0
<i>11-29</i>	5	1	0	4	1	0
<i>30-99</i>	1	0	1	2	0	0
<i>201+</i>	3	2	0	4	3	0
<i>Total:</i>	10	4	1	11	5	0
Township						
<i>1-10</i>	15	11	0	10	4	0
<i>11-29</i>	11	3	0	7	4	0
<i>30-99</i>	6	3	0	3	5	0
<i>Total:</i>	32	17	0	20	13	0
<i>Grand Totals:</i>	183	101	5	149	113	10

Other Training Requested

- 1 Hands-on Scenarios
- 2 Update & followup
- 3 Anything provided by MCOLES
- 4 Internet information.
- 5 Legal
- 6 Include in legal update.
- 7 Law amended or worded as such to help non-cert ofc
- 8 Too soon to evaluate impact of the new law.
- 9 Computer based interactive courses.
- 10 Sample policy
- 11 Updates

CCW Issues Needing Development for Training

Agency Type ***Number of Officers*** ***Issues:***

College/University **11-29**

- 1 Law is OK. If they fail to advise officer on traffic stop, we take appropriate action.
- 2 Traffic stops dealing with CCWs (standardized procedures).
- 3 When and where to carry.

College/University **30-99**

- 1 Department policy/procedure
 - 2 Recommended traffic stop protocols.
-

Municipal **1-10**

- 1 1. Legal issues of taking control of a weapon when a person evidences suspicious behavior. 2. Legal issues of taking control of weapons found on a person at a hospital when that person is incapable of making decisions.
- 2 Additional training in face to face encounters with CCW holders.
- 3 Can officers separate a holder from his/her weapon, etc.
- 4 CCW vs. police officer status
- 5 Change in laws, how it effect law enf officers. General safety issues.
- 6 Clarification of laws pertaining to reserve officers and others soon to retire
- 7 Clarify the statute so that it can be easily and equally interpreted. The law as it exists is overly complex with too many what ifs, buts and excepts.
- 8 Disclosure requirements
- 9 Each officer should have mandatory seminar(officer contact) completed before permit issues. Note funding by applicant.
- 10 Have a federal standard for all CCW training issues. This would make everyone know what is to be done for all CCWs.
- 11 I think 1/2 hour during a legal update would be sufficient. This is not that complicated compared to some other issues.
- 12 Immediate notification by driver or passenger of weapon in vehicle. Possession/control of weapons on traffic stop.
- 13 Just update training on CCW law where they can carry, hat they have to do if they are stopped in vehicle, mostly do's and don'ts for the CCW holder.
- 14 Law change updates.
- 15 Laws regarding confiscation and other procedures handling persons with weapons.
- 16 Leave the pistol of honest people alone - concentrate on felons.
- 17 Legal aspects; reacting to a person with a handgun.
- 18 More definitive on when officers can and cannot take a weapon.
- 19 Officer rights in separating weapons from CCW holders.
- 20 Proper documentation of violation for prosecution.

- 21 Reserve officers. Contact with a CCW permit-holder - responsibility.
- 22 Separation of firearm from licensee during encounters.
- 23 Street awareness, good common sense.
- 24 Taking control of weapons on traffic stops when and how. ID'ing CCW holders and if they are carrying.
- 25 The fact is we treat all people as though they are armed. We should come up with a standard for taking weapon if the officer believes there will be a problem.
- 26 Traffic stop considerations with a legally armed occupant.
- 27 Traffic Stops! The above listed scenarios covering separation would be useful
- 28 What the law allows and what the violations are.
- 29 When and how to separate subject from their weapon.
- 30 When and where to carry
- 31 When officers should take the weapon from CCW holders. What exemptions do the officers have under the CCW law. Where an active reserve officer can and can't carry a gun.

Municipal

11-29

-
- 1 Any legal basis to separate a CCW holder from their weapon prior to PC for an arrest. If there is a legal basis.
 - 2 Auxiliary officers and retirees.
 - 3 Before you can develop training the law needs to be clarified in many areas. Both MSP and MSA hear about these problems consistently.
 - 4 General protocol for the training of individuals to get their CCW license.
 - 5 How the state laws and federal laws conflict.
 - 6 How to handle the temporary separation issue.
 - 7 I don't feel 8 hours firearms training is sufficient for John Q Public, but I don't feel a veteran officer should have to take the training.
 - 8 In my opinion, the CCW law should allow retired Pos to carry without attending training class or the training should be provided.
 - 9 It was all spelled out clearly in the law.
 - 10 More funding to local level to cover costs mandated by statute.
 - 11 more standardization
 - 12 Not a priority. Many other more important issues to deal with.
 - 13 Not even all the prosecutors agree on what the laws mean - whatever you teach needs to be concise.
 - 14 Police officer encounters with people holding CCW licenses, i.e. when can and should an officer take weapon for safekeeping or confiscate, etc.
 - 15 Recommendations as to seizing weapons in incidents not involving an arrest - officers safety.
 - 16 seeing the weapon on a stop - take it during stop or leave it? When do officers actually seize weapon? Need more training for these particular areas.

- 17 Should just be made part of the legal update.
- 18 SOP when encountering CCW holders
- 19 Standard issues for enforcement
- 20 State line border issues. Do restrictions apply to Indiana and Illinois residents?
How do they know the restrictions.
- 21 Suggested procedure for conducting traffic stops. Take weapon until conclusion of stop? Or not?
- 22 The ethical and moral issues related to shoot/don't shoot situations.
- 23 Violations - from civil to felony.
- 24 When to take possession of the firearm. What to do with it. How to return it.

Municipal

30-99

- 1 As cases are decided, a synopsis of case law reference CCW license violations would be helpful as a tool.
- 2 Clarify the law. The attorney general issues new opinions every time that contradict each other.
- 3 Clear answer to officer authority to seize weapons during interaction.
- 4 How to safely handle weapons on traffic stops. What is preferred policy on weapon separation.
- 5 Identification of CCW holder via driver's license. Provisions of law requiring notification. Action by officer upon knowledge of firearm.
- 6 Legal opinions and training on when a person can and should be separated from the firearm.
- 7 More training on when and where the law is applicable.
- 8 Police carrying weapons off duty.
- 9 See #4 (Officers question what to do with the gun while they carry out a preliminary investigation/interview.)
- 10 Standardized policy/training for traffic stops.
- 11 Strong focus on when firearm use is legally feasible.
- 12 Traffic Stop, Subject Control and Citizen Encounter classes must include increased awareness of CCW law and impacts on tactics.
- 13 What to do when officer encounters a person with a CCW, in a hostile situation.

Municipal

100-200

- 1 Amend law to include airports as prohibited areas.
- 2 Decision shooting aspects, continual legal updates, officer safety vs. overaggressive appearance by officers.
- 3 Detailed overview of entire law- application process to violations of.
- 4 Law needs to be clarified regarding CCW permit holders notifying police they are CCW holders. There seems to be some confusion regarding when the CCW holders tell the police when they are contacted.

Other

11-29

1 Update on CCW laws

Sheriff **11-29**

- 1 A quick reference guide as to how the new CCW law(s) pertain to law enforcement officers themselves.
- 2 CCW vs. DNR laws.
- 3 Communication and explanation regarding CCW holder's rights and police officers, regarding officer safety.
- 4 Employer rights to establish "No Weapon Zones."
- 5 How do we get background checks on an applicant from mental health authorities
- 6 Knowledge of the law.
- 7 Notification of law changes.
- 8 Training not a real issue, but other aspects need to be addressed reference the law.
- 9 Where/when uniformed officers (corrections/posse) the law affects or does not affect them.

Sheriff **30-99**

- 1 Clarify the law.
- 2 Handling violations in gun-free zones.
- 3 Needs to have a comprehensive review conducted on restrictions currently in place for reserve officers, Sheriff's mounted division volunteers, etc. (corrections officers).
- 4 We have had no incidents to date.

Sheriff **100-200**

- 1 Familiarity of the law for line officers.
- 2 Out of state CCW permits and impact with Michigan law.
- 3 Weapon handling/storage, informing police officers that they have a handgun on them.

Sheriff **201+**

- 1 Guidelines for separation of weapon from holder on stops.

State **11-29**

- 1 Good understand of procedure on when and when not to take someone into custody.
- 2 More on when to seize weapon. Patrol tactics on how this is done safely.
- 3 Need more time for CCWs to be issued.
- 4 What to do in all CCW encounters.

State **30-99**

- 1 A class that covers p.o.s so they don't have to go through "civilian" training when they separate from an agency.
- 2 Update on law as it pertains to road patrol.

State **201+**

- 1 Better clarification on carrying a CCW while hunting.
- 2 New videos for any changes in CCW laws. Clarification of separation issues.
- 3 Patrols-what to ask, how to address separation issue.
- 4 The new law in relation to the patrol.
- 5 Under what circumstances might the CCW holder be separated from the weapon.

Township **1-10**

- 1 Clearer rules/laws - new/changes are coming to us every few months - too hard to keep track of what rule cancels what rule and what to go by.
- 2 I believe that all necessary issues on possessing and carrying a concealed weapons is covered.
- 3 Only the understanding of the laws pertaining to, if anyone really knows for sure?
- 4 Police reserve
- 5 Situations during hunting season and violations that relate in those areas.
- 6 The whole new law, not just a tape, but role playing, class discussion, and end the questions within the laws, I.e. when can you take control of a weapon? When is the holder required to advise the officer of his weapon?
- 7 When to arrest and when not to; when to confiscate and when not to; when alcohol is involved, is PBT sufficient or do we take them to Sheriff's Department
- 8 Yes, in the civilian training they are addressed, so what is good for the goose. . .

Township **11-29**

- 1 Annual training updates.
- 2 Gun Free Zones, Reserve Police Issues, Proper way to conduct traffic stop on CCW holder
- 3 Most administrators are overreacting. Common sense should be the standard. But since it isn't, see #8 below (would be interested in assisting.)
- 4 Reserve officers carrying weapon in weapon free zones.
- 5 Understanding of the law in detail.

Township **30-99**

- 1 Consistency/Timely Notification
 - 2 Inform officers at what point during an investigation they can or should relieve CCW holders of their weapons? What sanctions can be imposed upon officers who improperly separate CCW holders from their weapons.?
 - 3 Statewide standard (model) policy re: CPLs and when/if to disarm.
 - 4 When it would be appropriate to hold weapons during contacts.
-

Additional Comments on the Need for CCW Training

- 1 Please hurry!

- 2 There is no way for investigators to obtain information regarding an applicant's mental health status - this should be questioned? Training should also encompass this problem.
- 3 It would be nice to have the law enforcement community understand and be trained before any act/law takes effect. This CCW law is confusing and no one can give officers a straight answer on enforcement.
- 4 In-service regional training.
- 5 I think MCOLES has done a fine job with the new CCW information.
- 6 Crucial.
- 7 Not needed if people can read.
- 8 CCW updates every two yrs. At least!
- 9 Much still needs to be interpreted.
- 10 Info thus far seems sufficient at this time as the law is still new and no problems thus far.
- 11 Safety
- 12 Since enactment, there has been a number of changes. They all took time to disseminate to all agencies. This caused confusion/questions.
- 13 I believe statewide uniformity is important not just for officers, but also those people that have a CCW.
- 14 Necessary. The more that get CCW the more encounters the road patrolman is going to have.
- 15 As much for their own rights as those of the public.
- 16 Re question 8: extension 220
- 17 I think the area considering traffic stops needs to be addressed very soon. As the increase of permits overtakes us, it would be beneficial to the officers. Also, consider face to face dealings with CCW holders.
- 18 Re question 4: Prosecutor does not feel legislation would support this practice.
- 19 The quick reference card you just provided on federal firearms laws is good. How about one with the new CCW law and guidelines?
- 20 This agency only has pamphlets, received from state.
- 21 Immediate need to address civil liability issues.
- 22 Weapons Training People skills.
- 23 Needs to be reviewed for ex-law enforcement (retired) officers.
- 24 Review stop procedures, appropriate places to carry.
- 25 Needed.
- 26 We never received any video on CCW law, just booklets.
- 27 Re question 5: Arrests since July 1, 2001 not related to the new CCW legislation.
- 28 It is needed on an ongoing basis.

- 29 I believe that many current CCW holders are not advising that they are armed, and that many officers are not making an initial inquiry.
- 30 We have had no contact with a "legal" CCW holder. Are we missing them or are they not informing us of CCW?
- 31 Proper legislation first.
- 32 As with any new law, or change in the law, education is a key factor in the success of that law.
- 33 Keep up the good work!
- 34 A pocket check off list of do's and don'ts for an officer to have.
- 35 Cover this legislation in the new recruit training.
- 36 The materials provided so far have covered most issues.
- 37 The best in-service training I have seen comes from MSP's Lt. Greydanus. Let him speak of CCW issues while covering the updates.
- 38 This is such a new law and most officers do not know enough about this law or what they can or cannot do.
- 39 Each prosecutor's office needs to advise their departments on what to do or not to do!
- 40 Further training for officers so they have a better understanding of the law.
- 41 There are several opinions on how the law affects law enforcement officers.
- 42 As a very confusing/badly worded law - ongoing training may become necessary as court cases prevail and set precedence.
- 43 Citizen's awareness.
- 44 Should be covered in police academy and yearly in-service updates. Reviews of current case laws pertaining to this issue may be helpful.
- 45 This area is very confused and unsettled at this time. Additional training welcome.
- Re question 8 (assisting with development of training): Hosting training site; supplying officers for video role playing.
- 46 Any information or training is best presented through instruction and supported by written materials. In (-agency-) this would be easiest done in conjunction with our regular firearms training.
- 47 Re question 1: Excellent.
Re question 2: No-but they're out there.
Re question 4: No policy - officer discretion
- 48 As with any training I feel that it should be accepted and practiced across the state.
- 49 Our training center has developed and instructs both CCW applicants and local police officers about PA381/2000.
- 50 Need to rewrite the law! But as court decision better define issues these should be incorporated into training.
- 51 Because the way the law was put together to (sic) many unanswered questions need general training in problem areas.

- 52 Lots of confusion about this law, even as it pertains to permit requirements for reserves and retiring officers.
- (Question 1 - not seen tape)
- 53 Line officers need more info on how to process arrest and issue tickets for CCW civil violations.
- 54 Time will dictate-the individuals requesting CCW permits are just starting to receive them after the required training.
- 55 You need to standardize the training and make it easier for dept. trainers to teach individual department personnel, making them eligible to apply for CCCW permits (i.e. auxiliary depts/other personnel that wish to obtain a CCW permit).
- 56 Standardization. Traffic stops dealing with CCW - training in academy.
- 57 We have had no incidents, to date, nor have other agencies in our area. At this point we should wait.
- 58 Not everyone knows what to do. Even though it's discussed, situations don't happen that often.
- 59 Officers need continual review of when they can/cannot arrest.
- 60 Training for handling traffic stops with CCW occupants. Officer safety issues. Legal issues as taking control of weapon.
- 61 Law seems way too complicated for the average citizen to understand.
- 62 This matter has caused much alarm and confusion regarding basic contact scenarios. Standardized appropriate contact procedures need to be developed and disseminated to promote a reasonably consistent approach throughout Michigan.
- 63 Continued training and updates to help the officers more clearly understand the law and how to enforce it.
- 64 Right now is an excellent time to begin the training - the law is new and has many different sections dealing with violations and enforcement.
- 65 Does not seem to be a problem.
- 66 Re question 4/4a: Not yet - From what I have read the law is not clear on this.
- 67 Need legislative exemption for retiring officers' need for training.
- 68 More target practice and weapon usage.
- 69 The law needs to be clear and direct to the CCW permit holders. The question that keeps coming up to police officers is: At what point does the CCW holder tell the police when they are a CCW holder and have a weapon on their person.
- 70 Not sure any additional training is needed.
- 71 Fine now.
- 72 Need to revise the training requirement for those holding the classes - being certified by a national organization is a joke - one instructor here started his own national organization to skirt the law.